



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 1

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Www.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 1. What is Bannaawism?

An ideology that is centred around the concepts of rule and rulership and which seeks to gather all Muslims, regardless of orientation and belief, under one umbrella to achieve this aim, whether that be rebellion, underground movements, being involved with the politics of the state and the likes. The well known slogan of Bannawism is “Let us unite in that which we agree, and excuse each other in that which we disagree”, and this applies even if the points of difference are upon Shirk and Innovation.

Around the late 1920's the movement known as “al-Ikhwaan al-Muslimoon” (the Muslim Brotherhood) was set up by Hasan al-Banna with the following aim: To re-establish the overall Islamic authority, in the form of the overall leader of the Muslims. To this end, he innovated the principle, “Let us work together in that which we agree and excuse each other in that which we disagree”. The practical implementation of this principle required that no one, no matter how deviant, should be barred from working with Ikhwaan. For this reason everyone was accommodated; Soofees, Ash'arees, Jahmees, Mu'tazilees, Raafidees, until even the Egyptian Copts (Christians). At the same time, calls were made for nearness to the Raafidah and the removal of any barriers between them and Ahl us-Sunnah.

The Ikhwaan attempted to infiltrate the political arena and use whatever they could in order to fulfil their objectives and goals. This saw the emergence, for the first time, of an organised, calculated plan to encourage “Islamic activism” with a view to removing the current authority and replacing it with an Islamic authority - with a method that was essential political in nature. There was a lot of secrecy, party membership, calls to assassination plots, coups and the likes, and this way of thinking gradually spread to

other Muslim countries over the following decades. It would also later be found in the writings of prominent Ikhwanite figureheads in later decades.

Question 2. What is Qutubism?

An ideology that is centred around the concepts of rule and rulership and which seeks to bring this about by way of takfir of nation states and Muslim societies and rebellion against the authorities. The reference points of this ideology are the books and writings of Sayyid Qutb.

The 1950s and 1960s saw the emergence of the writings and teachings of Sayyid Qutb. Essentially, Qutb's teachings were that the fundamental basis of Tawheed is the Haakimiyyah of Allaah, and that this is the essential meaning of the Kalimah. Built upon this exaggeration, he performed takfir of all Muslim societies and nation states, because they did not judge by what Allaah has revealed in every matter. He claimed that there is no single Islamic society (i.e. a group of Muslim people) on the face of this earth and any such trace of it had disappeared centuries ago. Qutb entered extremism into the arena of takfir and haakimiyyah and his teachings also gave birth to a lot of destructive Takfir and Jihaad movements in the late 50s and 60s onwards. Almost all the groups today who are political and activist in nature (like Hizb ut-Tahrir, Jamaa'atul-Jihad, Takfeer wal-Hijrah and the likes) are all offshoots of Ikhwaan. The main protagonist of this thought, in the current times, is the brother of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb who emigrated to Saudi Arabia around the early 80s and then began to preach his doctrines to some of youth that were later to become puppets for the heads of Innovation amongst the Ikhwaan

Question 3. What is Suroorism?

A mixture of the above two, and which promotes hizbiyyah (party-spirit, partisanship) within its ranks, having secrecy, pledges of allegiance and the likes. Whereas Qutubism and Bannaa'ism were for the most part, restricted to the countries in which these thoughts originated, Suroorism, is concerned with the Arabian Peninsula, and hence those who are recruited or targeted are mainly those from the Gulf. This ideology is exemplified in the works and writings of Muhammad Suroor, a former Ikhwaani who from the early 1980s onwards set out on his mission to create a secret "Jamaa'ah", that would work in order to re-establish the Islamic Authority, by way of secret infiltration amongst the Salafis firstly, and then working towards a bloody revolution. He recruited Salman al-Awdah in the early 80s who became one of the main Suroori spokesmen and theoreticians in Arabia. Suroor made his intentions clear to some of people knowledge like Shaikh Muqbil and Shaikh Saleem al-Hilaalee, who subsequently warned from him and his Jamaa'ah. Suroor himself is one of the Operational Managers for this cult and is based in London, UK!! Al-Muntada, London, UK, is the organisational front for this da'wah, just like IANA in the US.

Question 4. What is Turaathism?

This is an ideology which is in reality modern-day Bannaa'ism and which calls the average common Muslim to get involved in "political work" under the guise of "Islamic democracy" (or Shurocracy!) and also for the promotion and commendation of the

existence of the multiplicity of Islamic groups and parties and co-operation between them. Hence, the existence of Ikhwan, Tabligh and Hizb ut-Tahrir are seen to be positive and “manifest goodness”. Also that the classical approaches of the Salaf are irrelevant to the times of today, and that the books of the past do not deal with today's issues, and that the Scholars of today (i.e. those of Ahl us-Sunnah) are actually present in body and absent in mind and mere mummified bodies who know nothing of the current affairs. The referent points of these teachings are Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayijee. Although this thought is actually the product of a few, the organisation of Ihyaat-Turaath was the fabric upon which it was built, spread and infused into the youth, across the globe. In essence, Turaathism is but born-again Bannaawism.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 2

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 5. Are there any distinguished teachings or principles found in these ideologies

Yes. In reality, what we see today of the confusion in the da'wah and the manhaj is a direct result of the penetration of the Ikhwaan into this da'wah and the revival of the teachings of Qutb and Bannaa, cleverly disguised as the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyyah. This confusion became most widespread in Sunni circles following the open da'wah of the Puppets of Aal Qutb and Mohammad Suroor in Arabia. Amongst the most salient features of their da'wah:

The Innovation of Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah : making Allaah's sole right to govern and legislate to be the essence and core of Tawheed, such that the Kalimah is to be explained by this meaning. This was first innovated by Mawdoodi and Qutb, and has in recent times been pushed and promoted by the likes of Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and their likes - by quoting directly and verbatim from the original propounder(s).

Ahl us-Sunnah affirm that Allaah has the sole right to legislate and judge and that this is from His Ruboobiyyah as it relates to Allaah, and from Uloohiyyah as it relates to the servants obligation to worship him alone. However, in Qutubism, this is exaggerated over everything else and made the sole point of concern in the da'wah. This is connected to the extremism that is also found in the arena of takfir and also jihad in those affected by the doctrines of Qutb and Bannaa.

This innovation is actually directed towards abolishing the tafseel of the Salaf in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, and pushing instead, the

absolution and generalisation found in the books of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and Safar al-Hawali into the minds of the masses. The issue of Haakimiyyah to all neo-Qutubites and neo-Bannaawites is related only to judgements related to the dealings between the people. As for issues of aqeedah and manhaj, then the neo-Qutubiyyah and neo-Bannaawiyyah are not fundamentally concerned with calling to judging by what Allaah has revealed in issues of aqeedah and manhaj. This illustrates that their concern with this Haakimiyyah of Qutb is only a political concern which has a political agenda, for if it had been otherwise, they would not have displayed such repugnant Irjaa' towards the Innovators.

The Innovation of al-Muwaazanaah : mentioning the good points of the Innovators when refuting them. And this was a ploy to make the teachings of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Bannaa more palatable to the Salafis. It is not correct that you mention the good points of the Innovators when refuting them, since this defeats the objective of warning from them in the first place. This innovation was propounded and enjoined by Salman al-Awdah and also Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq. In reality it is a revival of the Bannaawi Bid'ah, outlined above. The spokesmen of the Qutubi, Bannaawi manhaj knew that the Salafis would never dare to read the books of Qutb and Bannaa. Hence, they innovated this principles, to make the innovated teachings of Qutb and Bannaa (and their books) more palatable and easier to present to the youth.

The Innovation of the Permissibility of the Multiplicity of Groups : claiming that the existence of the various Islamic groups today is “manifest goodness” and that claiming otherwise is “an act of destruction”. And this is opposed by the clear texts of the Book and the Sunnah which condemn splitting and differing. And whoever considers the affair of the likes of these groups (Ikhwaan, Tabligh, Hizb ut-Tahrir) and the likes, then he will realise that they have split on the fundamentals of the aqeedah and the manhaj of the Salaf. So it is not a case of “allowable differing”. This innovation was unique to Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, and it is also in fact, a revival of the bid'ah of Bannaa, as outlined above. The effects of this innovation is also manifested by the fact that many of those upon the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa today show allegiance based not upon the Salafi Aqeedah, but based upon their own form of exaggerated Haakimiyyah. Hence, you see them showing loyalty for the sake of Deobandite, Muqallid Hanafis, who hold beliefs reaching the level of kufr and the greatest of innovations - merely because they have established the hudood and other affairs related to the governing of a state - and at the same time they wage a war against the adherents to the pure and clear Salafi aqeedah, but who fall into the affairs of sin and disobedience and the major sins and the likes.

The Innovation of Takfir of the Sinners : claiming that those who promote sins, or boast about the sins they committed, or those who call to sin (such as drinking, fornication and the likes) that all of this is kufr and its perpetrator is an apostate. And this is but the madhhab of the Khawaarij. They were lead to revive this innovation due to their extremism in the field of al-Haakimiyyah and making the rule and rulership the most special characteristic of Tawheed. They reasoned that a person who does these acts, must not be really judging by what Allaah has revealed, because a person

can only fall into these acts (of open sin and boasting about sin), and persisting in them, and committing them in an organised, regular manner if he considers them to be permissible and hence making halaal what Allaah made haraam is kufr. So in this manner, they judged the open sinners to be disbelievers. This was spoken of by Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah, and is something that is found amongst most Kharijite Renegades in that they take issues of sin, like fornication, usury, bribery, tyranny and oppression and the likes - which no doubt occurs in all Muslim countries - and then based upon these affairs they attribute kufr (i.e. the major kufr) to whole governments and states.

The Innovation of Extremism in Fiqh ul-Waaqi': And this relates to the knowledge of current affairs and what is happening in the Ummah. While this is from the Sharee'ah, with conditions, limits and guidelines as to who can indulge in it, those who are upon the ideology of Qutubism, Bannaawism, Turaathism and Suroorism, have gone to extremes in this regard and occupied the youth, away from learning of the religion and into learning about the plots, plans and conspiracies of the Infidels, bewildering and confusing the youth in all of that. This is actually connected with their need to engage the masses in "political work" and "activism", such that the power is with the people, and hence, they can then be mobilised into taking part in democratic elections to effect change, or led into a bloody revolution.

The Innovation of Attacking the Honour of the Scholars: And this is an old innovation first introduced by the Mu'tazilah who began to call the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah as "The Scholars of Women's Menses and Impurities" because they did not indulge in their Ilm ul-Kalaam (Theological Rhetoric or Philosophical Thought) and hence they claimed these scholars knew nothing of the affairs. In a similar vain, those upon the ideologies listed above, labelled our Ulamaa "Scholars of Women's Menses and Impurities" and the "Skin-Deep Ulamaa" and "Present in Body, Absent in Mind" and other such things - because, as they claim, they do not know anything about the current affairs. However, these attacks and slanders have only arisen because our Scholars did not agree to their innovation of extremism in Fiqh ul-Waaqi'. This occurred from the likes of Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and others. There is no doubt that the Qutubiyyah do not hold Fiqh ul-Waaqi' to be fard 'ayn (obligatory upon everyone), yet if this is the case, why then did they assault and accuse the Salafi Mashayikh and scorn them and ridicule them for not knowing the current affairs?!

The Innovation of Showing Loyalty for the Sake of the Innovators: And because the source of the teachings of those upon these ideologies were those who fell into the greatest of innovations (until even statements of kufr and apostasy), such as Sayyid Qutb, then they began to show undue loyalty and love for these innovators, loving and hating for their sake - despite their knowledge that these people fell into the greatest of innovations and mistakes and had deviation in the fields of Aqidah and Tawheed. So they began to defend the likes of these Innovators, whilst at the same time, assaulting the Shaikhs of Ahl us-Sunnah, those who were sound in Aqidah, Tawheed and Sunnah. This was most clearly exemplified (and still is) by the likes of Salman al-

Awdah and Safar al-Hawali, and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and all of this is the legacy of Hassan al-Banna.

The Innovation of Extremism in Jihaad: And because of what was promised by Allaah concerning the humiliation of this Ummah and the domination of the enemies, then those upon the ideologies listed above want to engage the Ummah in a Jihad which is actually premature. Meaning that the precursors to this Jihaad are not in place. We find much Shirk and Innovation in the Ummah, much sins and disobedience, the spread and vice and so on. Alongside all of that, the “Jihadists” have abandoned the methodology of the Prophets in laying down the foundations for this true Jihaad. Hence, the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah, tried to redress this imbalance by placing less emphasis on the type of Jihad these people were calling to (which was mainly derived from the teachings of Sayyid Qutb, a destructive partisan Jihaad that is directed towards states and governments), and more emphasis on the concepts of purification of the Islamic aqidah and tawheed and cultivation of the Ummah upon it, such that the Jihaad that will, in truth, be aided by Allaah, can come into effect. However, those who did not adhere to the methodology of the Prophets thought that this was a denial of Jihad and a belittlement of it, and cowardice and submission to the enemy. And this was from their ignorance, since Jihaad is not merely the outward manifestation of physical fighting, it has many levels and stages and types. No one denies Jihad, but the issue is that we have to prepare for it in the manner Allaah has outlined, both in terms of aqidah and tawheed and purifying the Ummah of all the filth that has crept in, then by way of taqwaa and righteous actions, and then also physical and military preparations. However, those who have entered into the innovation of Qutubism and Bannaawism and the likes, then instead of patiently nurturing the youth upon the likes of these affairs, they have involved them with ‘fiqh ul-waaqi’“, engrossed them in Politics, taken them away from the Rabbaani, Senior, Erudite Scholars and instead taken them to the heads of Innovation such as Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna and Mawdoodi and the likes and the extremism found in their teachings. Hence, they are not involved in the required tasfiyah (purification) and tarbiyah (cultivation) - that is on a collective, societal level. Rather, they have made something other than this to be the starting point of their da'wh whether it be Jihaad, or Politics or Haakimiyyah or the other affairs, on a collective, societal level, and then they show loyalty and disownment based upon their orientation - not for the sake of the Salafi Aqeedah and Manhaj. This is why you see them defend a Raafidee Heretic (Sayyid Qutb) who attacked one of Allaah's Messengers, and who spoke almost every innovation in history. Hence, their loyalty is not for the sake of the Salafi Aqeedah but for something else.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 3

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 6. What effects have these ideologies and their principles and ideas had on the da'wah

The effects are somewhat outlined in the answer to Question 5, but to elaborate a bit more:

In the field of takfir and haakimiyyah :Obviously, great confusion in the fields of takfir and haakimiyyah. The orientations of many of those claiming to be Salafis today are centred around the issues of rule and rulership. A concerted propaganda campaign by the likes of Mohammad Qutb and Safar al-Hawali and others from the neo-Qutubiyyah has led to the proliferation of the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb concerning these issues - and subsequently, great confusion has arisen. In particular, the tafseel of the Salaf in this affair was demolished and pushed aside to make way for the absolution of Aal Qutb, who were portrayed as “the carriers of the flag of al-Haakimiyyah” - that is the politicised form of Haakimiyyah that is restricted only to the affairs of rule and rulership, not the overall inclusive Haakimiyyah that relates to affairs of aqeedah and ibaadah and manhaj and ittibaa’ as well as relating to social dealings and governance of the state.

In the field of al-jarh wat-ta'deel: Great confusion in the fields of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel and this has affected many unsuspecting Salafis, until even those who are attached to the right Scholars, but have shubuhaat with them, because of their ignorance or because of their mixing with Ahl ul-Ahwaa and becoming affected by them. Amongst this confusion are the following:

- Claiming that a scholar can only make a refutation of someone if he has heard that person's words directly with his own ears or read them himself with his own eyes. This is pure falsehood and total, sheer, compound ignorance of the Sunnah and the sciences that come from it, foremost amongst them the science of hadeeth itself. It is sufficient that a reliable, trustworthy person's report, who has no defects in his memory, is acceptable as witness.
- Claiming that if you identify someone as being "Qutubi" or "Hizbi" and "off the manhaj" and the likes that you have declared him an Innovator. And this is not true, since labelling a person with the likes of these affairs is to indicate that he has "dakhan" (a blemish, or impurity) and that he is characterised by a particular orientation or belief which is in opposition to the Qur'aan and the Sunnah, and which is dangerous for the common Muslims. As for declaring him an Innovator, then that is yet another step and level.
- Claiming that in order to accept the criticism of a scholar of a particular individual that you have to see the proof. This is actually similar to the first claim above and again shows severe ignorance of the science of hadeeth. Scores and scores of the muhadditheen accept the jarh (criticism) of other muhadditheen, because they are reliable and trustworthy in their judgement.
- That whenever someone is criticised and disparaged for some affair, then all his virtues must be presented and whatever service they have offered to Islaam and the Muslims must not go unmentioned, and that failing to do this is "dhulm" (oppression). This led to the gradual treatment of the affairs of tawheed, innovation, shirk, hizbiyyah and the likes, as mere differences in fiqh and unworthy of rejection!!

In the field of safeguarding the correct manhaj and its adherents: Treating errors in manhaj to be the same as errors in viewpoints in fiqh, and then accusing Ahl us-Sunnah of going on "witch-hunts" for people. Unfortunately, due to the proliferation of the teachings of Qutb and Bannaa, much confusion exists in the minds of people, due to the great ignorance that has emerged on the issues of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel - and this confusion is perpetuated by the people who are actually upon the thought of Qutb and Bannaa. And this is done so that their deviations in manhaj (which have actually been outlined earlier) are not perceived as serious errors that need to be warned against. In turn, many unsuspecting people, until even those who subscribe to the Salafi way, are affected and confused and consider any attempt to highlight or warn against a person's orientation, or a person's allegiances and the likes is "fitnah".

In the field of boycotting the innovators and biased partisans: Great confusion on the issues of boycotting a person who is affected by innovation or inclines to the Innovators or displays something from the desires, such as hizbiyyah. This confusion is perpetuated by quoting words from the Scholars (like Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah) in that boycotting the innovators and the deviants and the likes is only when Ahl us-Sunnah have strength in the da'wah. And then arguing that since Ahl us-

Sunnah are not like that today, that this form of boycotting is not allowed. And in reality, there are two objectives behind boycotting (hajr): a) as a form of punishment, so that a person may return and b) as a form of protecting oneself from being affected. It is the first one that is to be performed when Ahl us-Sunnah have strength, in a particular location or area or time. And as for the second, protecting oneself, then this applies in all situations - when the situation demands that. Because of the confusion in this regard many from Ahl us-Sunnah have been led into the innovated calls of the biased partisans of today, because of their not keeping away from the people of deviation and confusion. Until even many of those who had knowledge were sound and upright became led astray! How then for the common people?

In the field of “collective work” and co-operation: Great confusion in the arena of “collective work”. The teachings of Bannaa saw the emergence of “institutionalised Hizbiyyah” which spread rapidly alongside the proliferation of the da’wah of Ikhwaan. This then saw the emergence of hizbiyyah in the form of societies (Jam’iyyaat), organisations, and groups, and also hizbiyyah to individuals, such that loyalty and disownment was shown purely for their sake and for the sake of their particular form of da’wah and not for the sake of the aqeedah and manhaj found in the Book and the Sunnah. The proliferation of this hizbiyyah has been so great that it has affected even the unsuspecting Salafi. And this is exemplified in the huge uproar that is created sometimes by those ascribing themselves to the Sunnah, when a person, or a da’ee or a person of knowledge is disparaged or criticised or exposed to be upon a deviant manhaj - so the initial reaction is one of disbelief and uproar, rather than checking to see if the criticism has come from sound, upright, trustworthy people (thiqah), who are from the scholars or known to the scholars.

In relation to the callers and workers for da’wah: The raising of the da’ees (callers) and intellectual thinkers into the level of major scholars, which again perpetuated the hizbiyyah towards the likes of these people who were seen to be “working for Islaam” - albeit upon innovated and deviated methodologies and principles, having separated themselves from Ahl ul-Hadeeth, the Taa’ifat ul-Mansoorah an-Naajiyah, in their da’wah work.

In relation to the focus of da’wah: Pushing the focus of the da’wah towards the rulers, rulership, governments and the state. And this has been one of the most harmful effects to the da’wah, in that it has led to a clear deviation from the da’wah of the Prophets and their methodology in bringing about reform and rectification of the society. Hence, the concepts of Haakimiyyah, Jihaad, “Collective [Political] Work”, enjoining the good and forbidding the evil, are all confined to the arena of the rulers and rulership, fundamentally. The rulers and flaws in the issue of rulership are made to be the sole cause of all of the Ummah’s calamities, and the blame is constantly directed towards the rulers and governments. This has caused great harm and corruption to the minds and intellects of the Muslims, since it negates any admission of the fact that there is something fundamentally wrong with the Ummah itself and that it is being subject to punishment for its deviation in its Tawheed and in its Aqeedah and in its Ibaadah and the likes, and that Allaah punishes the Ummah on

account of its disobedience to Allaah and His Messenger and on account of ungratefulness and the emergence of Shirk and Innovation. And the Rulers are not the only ones who disobey and who fall into the likes of these crimes. There is much deviation and corruption in the common Muslims, amongst the Innovators and Heretics and the society at large. Rather it is the whole Ummah, collectively. But despite that we commonly see the calls and slogans “Muslims need to unite”, “the Muslims are not organised”, “the Muslims should forget differences”, “its the fault of the corrupt apostate rulers” and the likes of these statements, which are representative of great deviation and rejection of the way that Allaah operates with respect to His creation. As for the issue of the rulers then that will be dealt with in what is to follow. Hence, on account of the destructive ideologies and partisan calls, the da’wah has suffered and has been terminated immaturely by directing it into arenas which have not really produced any fruits, and in fact will not produce any fruits.

In relation to the entrance of Kharijite elements into the da’wah: The manifestation of the da’wah of Ikhwaan within Saudi Arabia, (at the hands of the Ikhwaani Puppets), - [a da’wah which is in reality, as a sum whole, the modern day da’wah of the Khawaarij] - the outright Khawaarij and outright Takfiris and the movements of Takfir, Jihaad and Khurooj, were given a new lease of life. Seeing the emergence of this da’wah at the hands of the likes of Safar and Salman, all Kharijite renegades, biased partisans, and activists, in all corners of the globe, immediately saw in this da’wah what gave support to what they were already upon of the notions of Sayyid Qutb – this is because in reality, Safar and Salman were actually pushing the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb, from the very books of Sayyid Qutb. This saw the gradual penetration of the Jihadis, Takfiris and outright Khawarij into the da’wah of Ahl us-Sunnah, as a result of which even greater confusion was caused. The fine line that had been in existence between Ahl us-Sunnah and its da’wah and the da’wah of the Innovators had now been blurred, and the distinctness was no longer present. In turn this created a great deal of confusion within Sunni circles, when the knowledge-based and doctrinal issues commonly discussed within Takfiri, Khariji circles, were brought into the open and introduced to the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah. So whoever was ignorant became confused, and whoever was confused became enticed, and whoever was weak – in knowledge and perception – got bewildered.

And there are many others, but this is just by way of example.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 4

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 7. Since these ideologies are related to rule and rulership what is the situation with the rulers of today?

The rulers of today are between the states of fisq (disobedience), dhulm (oppression) and kufr (disbelief) – based upon the state and condition of their beliefs, statements and actions – in accordance with the tafseel of the Salaf on the issues of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. The likes of these affairs and judgements concerning them are referred back to the Senior and Erudite Ulamaa who are upon the manifest Salafi aqeedah and manhaj and not the theoreticians and thinkers who are upon the adulterations of Qutb and Bannaa, or at least influenced by them – and how many they are. The affairs of the Rulers is a great and delicate one and due to mistakes made in this regard great calamities have occurred in the Ummah.

As for collecting and gathering the sayings of so and so ruler and so and so politician, which are in support of secularism, or in support of non-Islamic laws or which call for a departure from Islamic laws and the likes, and then using that to illustrate or imply the kufr of the whole nation state, or of the whole government and what it contains of innocent people and workers – then presenting all of that to the youth, and using all of that to introduce the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, then indeed, all of that is a wastage of the youth. If the president or prime minister of Tunisia issued a legislation to forbid Hijab, or if the Turkish government did likewise, or if the Prime Minister of Pakistan refused to listen to calls to implement full Sharee'ah, and so on, then of what benefit is it to present this to the youth, except to stir up their emotions and sentiments and to lead them into the destructive da'wah and manhaj of Sayyid Qutb of takfir of whole nation states and bloody revolutions. These kinds of activities (of demonstrating the kufr of whole nation states and governments) is the clearest of

indications of the proliferation of the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and it also indicates that those whose da'wah revolves around the likes of these affairs, only have one thing in mind – and it certainly is not the Rabbaani Manhaj of Nubuwwah, that is the methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah - which is indeed diametrically opposed to the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa..

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, “These words are very good (i.e. Imaam al-Albaanee’s). Meaning, that those people pass judgement against the Rulers of the Muslims, that they are disbelievers, what benefit do they achieve by judging them to be disbelievers? Are they able to put an end to them? They are not able. And when it is the case that the Jews have occupied Palestine for around 50 years, yet despite that the Islamic Ummah has not been able in its entirety – Arabs and Non-Arabs alike – to remove them from their place! **How then, after this, can we go and strike those who rule over us with our tongues (i.e. make takfir of them) while we know that we are not capable of putting an end to them, and that blood will be shed, and the taking of wealth will become lawful, and even the honours of people. And then we will not even have achieved the desired result!! Therefore, what is the benefit – such that if a person was to believe – in that which is between him and his Lord – that amongst the rulers is one who is a disbeliever in truth, with the kufr that ejects from the religion - what then is the benefit in announcing this and spreading this, except the kindling of tribulation?!**” (Fitnah of Takfir, p.74)

As we will see in what occurs below, the placement by Allaah of the likes of these people (i.e. rulers) over the Muslims is indicative of another more deeper problem. So either the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Bannaawiyyah and Turaathiyyah, are wholly and grossly ignorant of the way in which Allaah operates with respect to His creation, or they know but they are filled with desires and are poisoned by innovation and desire nothing but destruction of the worldly affairs, by occupying the Ummah in those things which cannot be repelled by the use of the sword – without at the same time leading to greater afflictions. There is nothing more wiser concerning the likes of these affairs than the saying of Shaikh Muqbil as occurs in his Fataawaa, by way of meaning: “Leave alone the rulers and the governments, for they care nothing about you, and you will not be able to do anything to change them, so do not waste your time with them, but attend to da'wah and the correction of your own selves.” And indeed what Shaikh Muqbil indicated is but the very legacy of the Salaf as we will see in the answer to the next question.

As for individuals, or politicians, or thinkers and theorists, or rulers, from whom clear kufr is observed – in their writing, or their speech – then these affairs, are referred back to the ‘Ulamaa who – in light of the manhaj of the Salaf on the issue of takfir of a specific individual - will give a ruling. There is no-one who denies takfir of the apostates. It is a Sharee’ah ruling. But there is difference between takfir of individuals upon the manhaj and guidelines of the Salaf, and between the general, well-defined and proliferated methodology that exists today, of demonstrating the kufr of individuals (without adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf on the issues of takfir) and of

governments and whole nation states – and building a whole methodology around this, such that the youth are pushed in the direction of the extremist Haakimiyyah of Qutb and Mawdudi, thinking that bloody and violent revolutions and organized overthrows, are the way to end the Ummah's problems and to help establish Allaah's Tawheed!!

Question 8. What about the tyranny of the rulers and the harm brought upon the Muslims?

In light of the clear texts of the Book and the Sunnah and the understanding of the Salaf, all of these affairs of tyranny and oppression and the absence of security and sanctity within the framework of an Islamic state, then all of these are symptoms and not the fundamental causes (of the Ummah's problems). This is different to the Innovators, who consider the likes of these affairs to be fundamental causes and not symptoms, and hence, make the basis of their da'wah, orientations, outlooks, writings, expressions, feelings to be centered around what they see to be the causes (which are in reality symptoms). And their error is readily apparent, in light of the saying of Allaah in an-Nur (24):55 and an-Nahl (16):112 and other verses, and also from the Manifest Sunnah and also from the sayings of the Salaf.

Stated Ibn Abil-'Izz al-Hanafi, "And as for adhereing to obedience to them (the Rulers), even if they commit oppression, then this is because the evils and harms that arise on account of rebelling against them, is numerous times more than that which occurs as a result of the oppression of the Rulers themselves. Rather, in having patience over their oppression there is expiation of sins, and a multiplication of the reward. **For Allaah did not empower them over us, except due to the corruption in our actions, and the recompense for an action is its like (al-jazaa'u min jins il-'amal).** Hence, it is upon us to strive (ijtihaad) in seeking forgiveness, making repentance and rectification of our actions. Allaah the Most High said, **"And whatever affliction befalls you, then it is from what your hands have earned, yet He pardons many"** ... and He the Most High said, **"...And whatever evil befalls you, then it is from your own soul"**, and He the Most High said, **"And thus do we turn some of the oppressors against others on account of what they used to earn"**. Hence, if the subjects (of a state) wish to save themselves from the oppression of the tyrannical ruler, then let them abandon oppression themselves." (Sharh Aqeedat ut-Tahaawiyyah).

Ibn Sa'd relates in his Tabaqaat al-Kubraa (7/163-165), "A group of Muslims came to al-Hasan al-Basree seeking a verdict to rebel against al-Hajjaaj [a tyrannical and despotic ruler]. So they said, "O Abu Sa'eed! What do you say about fighting this oppressor who has unlawfully spilt blood and unlawfully taken wealth and did this and that?" So al-Hasan said, "I hold that he should not be fought. If this is a punishment from Allaah, then you will not be able to remove it with your swords. If this is a trial from Allaah, then be patient until Allaah's judgement comes, and He is the best of judges." So they left al-Hasan, disagreed with him and rebelled against al-Hajjaaj – so al-Hajjaaj killed them all. Al-Hasan used to say, "If the people had patience when they are being tested by their unjust ruler, it will not be long before Allaah will give them a

way out. However, they always rush for their swords, so they are left with their swords. By Allaah! Not even for a single day did they bring about any good.”

Al-Hasan al-Basree (d.110) said, “Verily, al-Hajjaaj is the punishment of Allaah. So do not repel the punishment of Allaah with your own hands. But you must submit and show humility, for Allaah the Most High stated, “And indeed We seized them with punishment, but they humbled not themselves to their Lord, nor did they invoke (Allâh) with submission to Him.” (Al-Mu’minun 23:76). (Minhaj us-Sunnah of Shaikh ul-Islam 4/528)

Stated al-Hasan al-Basri, “Know – may Allaah pardon you – that the tyranny of the kings is a retribution (niqmah) from among the retributions of Allaah the Most High. And Allaah’s retributions are not to be faced with the sword, but they are to be faced with taqwaa and are repelled with supplication and repentance, remorse (inaabah) and abstention from sins. Verily, when the punishments of Allaah are met with the sword, are more severe. And Maalik bin Deenaar narrated to me that al-Hajjaaj (Ibn Yoosuf) used to say, “Know that every time you commit a sin Allaah will bring about a punishment from the direction of your ruler (sultaan)”. And I have I have also been told that a person said to al-Hajjaaj, “Do you do such and such with the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)?” So he replied, **‘For the reason that I am the punishment of Allaah upon the people of Iraaq, when they innovated into their religion whatever they innovated, and when they abandoned the commands of the their Prophet – alaihis salaam – whatever they abandoned.’** (Adaab Hasan al-Basri, of Ibn al-Jawzee, pp.119-120, by way of Mu’aamalat ul-Hukkaam, of Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis).

Where are the adulterated teachings of the likes of Sayyid Qutb compared to the legacy of Imaams of the Salaf? Where are the neo-Qutubiyyah, like Safar and Salman and ‘Umar and Munajjid who but present the books of bid’ah and zandaqah to the youth, nurturing them upon the likes of these affairs (the affairs of destruction and wastage), with such great deceit and treachery, the while they claim love and respect for the Salafi aqeedah and its Imaams, pretending to be ignorant of the greatest of calamities in aqeedah, and wicked lies against Allaah and His religion, in the books they present to the youth? Where is the firqah of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, the Turaathiyyah, and its adulterated teachings of Shurocracy and accommodating the groups of innovation compared to the Imaams of the Salaf? Where are the Surooriyyoon and where is their disease and their plague compared to what has been reported from the Imaams of the Salaf? Where are the Qutubists of the West, like Salaah as-Saawee, Ali at-Tameemee and the Innovators of IANA compared to our Salaf? Where are the likes of Abul-Haawiyah who out of great deceit and treachery defend the neo-Qutubites, show loyalty and allegiance to the Qutubists of the West (like Ali at-Tameemee) and enter them upon the youth, encouraging them to sit and attend their gatherings, confusing the youth and betraying them, while at the same warning from the Salafis, who present nothing but the clear and pure manhaj of Nubuwwah to the people and who direct them to nothing but what the Imaams of the Salaf advised, and warn from the greatest of innovatory orientations and

methodologies that have plagued Ahl us-Sunnah in recent times? For how long will this fraud last and for how long will they continue in this despicable state?



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 5

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 9: Why is the Ummah not able to rule by what Allaah has revealed in all of its affairs?

The inability of the Ummah in the present times, to judge by what Allaah has revealed, and to organise itself in accordance with the teachings of the Book and the Sunnah, is because of its sinfulness and disobedience and the emergence and spread of Shirk and Innovation [at alarmingly large levels] within the Ummah, the general populace. Hence, the cause is not the corrupt rulers and governments, fundamentally, it is something that comes before that. All of this is manifestly clear in the Book and the Sunnah and the sayings of the Sahaabah and the Taabi'een and the Salaf after them. It is manifestly clear in the greatest of ways...and hence, there is no excuse for the bid'ahs of Qutb and Banna and Suroor and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq – there is no excuse for the way has been made clear and it is upon the Ummah to follow. It is manifestly clear in the saying of Allaah in Surah Nur (24):55.

Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan stated, “Thus it is necessary for these groups to correct their concepts and understanding, by referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to know the methodology of the Messengers in calling to Allaah. For indeed Allaah - the One free from all imperfections - informed that correct rule and sovereignty, which is the central part of the call of the former jamaa 'ah whom we mentioned, cannot be achieved except after correcting aqeedah, such that all worship is for Allaah alone and worship of everything else is abandoned. Allaah - the Most High - says:

Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan (true faith and belief) and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those

before them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors.

Soorah an-Noor 24:55

So these people wish to establish the Islaamic State before purifying the lands of idolatrous beliefs which take the form of worship of the dead, and devotion to the tombs - such as is no different to the worship of al-Laat, al-Uzzaa and the third of them Manaaf, rather it is worse. So they are attempting that which is impossible..." (Introduction to 'Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa' of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee).

Thus, the great extremism and exaggeration in the arena of the rulers and rulership that has been entered into the da'wah on account of the ideologies like Qutubism, Bannaawism, Suroorism and the likes, then all of that has caused great imbalance and great deviation – in that it has made the focus of da'wah to be centred around the rulers and rulership and issues of “being organised” and taking part in “collective work” which has no limits and guidelines, and calls to destructive Jihaads (within Muslim countries, between the governments and subjects). All of this has had wicked effects and evil consequences and the unnecessary loss of lives and wasted efforts and toiling over the decades – and refuge is from Allaah.

These deviant and extremist orientations have in turn also led the emergence of the accusations against Ahl us-Sunnah that they are “stooges”, “government-backed”, “pawns”, “paid workers”, “agents” and the likes. All of this when Ahl us-Sunnah rejected their extremism and did not adopt the heresies of Qutb and Bannaa, but rather refuted them, and adhered instead to the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah. So all of this has brought untold damage and destruction to the da'wah and it has led to the demonisation of Ahl us-Sunnah in the eyes of the people and making the general-folk who have been filled with sentiment and emotions by the Political Activists (of Qutubism, Bannaawism, Suroorism and Turaathism) to hate Ahl us-Sunnah and to accuse them of being “government-backed” and “stooges” and “supporting the new world order” and the likes. And there is no doubt that the likes of these affairs (i.e. in these ideas in the minds of people) are what eventually lead to the bloodshed of innocent men and women, with the claim that because they are not with the Kharijite [Qutubite, Suroorite, Bannaawite] Renegades in opposing the corrupt rulers, or “apostate states”, then they must be with the rulers and the state, and they must be pleased with the status-quo and hence, they must be upon disbelief and hence, it is lawful to kill them. And by Allaah, this is what happened in Algeria, when the oppressing, innovating renegades took the lives of many of the Salafi callers and people of knowledge.

Stated Shaikh Abdul-Malik ar-Ramadaanee in this book that is the annoying thorn in the throat of the Innovators, Madaarik un-Nadhar Fis-Siyaasah (pp.357-358, 2nd ed.), in the course of exposing the scandal of the neo-Qutubite, Salman al-Awdah "...Just as they (the revolutionary takfiris of Algeria) had murdered many of the leading scholars, despite the fact that they had no involvement whatsoever with political activity, not even the slightest bit! And as for threatening the Salafi Du'aat with death, then this is only too famous and known to be worthy of mention. And Allaah alone is the One sought for help against what you describe the Algerian Salvation Front with, that it is Salafiyyah, O Salmaan [al-Awdah]!...Indeed they made lawful the blood of those Salafi Du'aat because they did not join the Front and nor did they believe in Hizbiyyah (partisanship). And then many of them were slaughtered until one of them could not even pray Fajr, Maghrib or Ishaah in the mosque out of the fear of being assassinated. A person would not fear the soldiers of the government as he would from the soldiers of the brethren in Islaam!! Until one of them said, "We have become like the Hypocrites in our abandonment of Fajr and Ishaah' in Jamaa'ah!" They (the revolutionary takfiris) prevented them from teaching the religion to the people, and yet others they slaughtered, because they did not participate with them in the slaughtering of the (tribe of) Bu Sulaimaanee and the Salafi Du'aat and Khutubaa' such as Muhammad al-Ameen al-Jalfaawee, and Abbaas Tayyiboon in the city of Bal-Abbaas, and also the Khateeb 'Abdul-Qaadir Mukhtaaree... and there are many others besides them. And to this day, the Salafis keep falling (i.e. are killed) at the hands of those, one after another. And they also killed the women who did not cover themselves up properly, they did this so it would be a lesson to other women!! And likewise those who were employed in state and government bodies (such as customs, tax offices and so on) were threatened with death if they went to their workplaces. And it is also strange that those who worked in the Military in order to fulfil what was called "the national duty" were also killed by this Jamaa'ah (i.e. the revolutionary takfiris) without first being asked to repent (istitaabah), even if they were actually compelled (to work with the Military)...."

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And the way, seerah, of the Muslims has never ceased upon this (methodology). They did not declare them (i.e. the Khawarij) to be apostates like those whom as-Siddiq (radiallaahu anhu) fought against. And this despite the command of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) to fight against them, as occurs in the authentic hadiths, and also despite what has been reported about them in the hadeeth of Abu Umaamah, collected by at-Tirmidhi and others [declared Saheeh by al-Albaanee] that they are "the most evil of those who are killed under the sky and how excellent is the one killed by them". Meaning that they are more harmful to the Muslims than others, for there are none which are more harmful to the Muslims than them, neither the Jews and nor the Christians. For they strived to kill every Muslim who did not agree with their view, declaring the blood of the Muslims, their wealth, and the slaying of their children to be lawful, while making takfir of them. And they considered this to be worship, due to their ignorance and their innovation that caused to stray..." Minhaj us-Sunnah 5/248.

And it is for this reason that the Khawaarij are more harmful to Islaam and the Muslims, as textually stated by Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, and it is also for this reason that the books of Sayyid Qutb and Mawdudi and Suroor and Safar al-Hawali and Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah and all neo-Kharijite Renegades should be rounded up and burnt, for the better good of the Ummah and its future! For it is the likes of these books that - over time – allow the emergence of the likes of these ideas in the minds of the people – such that Satan the Accursed can mobilise them to cause destruction to themselves and to their worldly affairs – the while the Kuffaar sit and watch, while what they desire to see is being performed for them, by the Muslims themselves, without them even lifting a finger! It is for this reason that many of the notables like Shaikh Rabee' and Shaikh Muqbil and others state that revolutions and coups are from the ways of the Infidels in causing destruction to nations and states, and that the Kuffar have infiltrated the likes of Ikhwaan a long time ago and that they strive in order to bring about revolutions in the Muslim lands to destabilise them and bring them to ruin.

Hence, it is necessary for the likes of these books to be destroyed and those who write them and present the heretical teachings (of Qutb and Mawdudi) to be refuted, and exposed and banished, such that the Ummah is freed from their tribulation and is saved from their [Devil's] deception. And it is also necessary **'for these groups to correct their concepts and understanding, by referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to know the methodology of the Messengers in calling to Allaah. For indeed Allaah - the One free from all imperfections - informed that correct rule and sovereignty, which is the central part of the call of the former jamaa 'ah whom we mentioned, cannot be achieved except after correcting aqeedah, such that all worship is for Allaah alone and worship of everything else is abandoned.'**



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 6

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 10. What about obedience to these rulers (who do not judge by the Sharee'ah in all affairs)?

As for obedience to the Rulers, then regardless of their level of tyranny and disobedience, then they must be given obedience in that which is good.

From Hudhaifah Ibn al-Yamaan (radiallaahu anhu) who said, "I said: "O Messenger of Allaah! We used to be in a state of evil, then Allaah brought this good, which we are now in. Will there be any evil after this good?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Will there be any evil after that good?" He said, "Yes." I said, "How will it be?". He said, **"There will be after me Leaders who do not guide themselves with my guidance and nor do they adopt my Sunnah, and there will arise from amongst them, men with the hearts of devils in the bodies of men."** I said, "What shall I do then, If I reach that time?" He said, **"Hear and obey the leader, even if he strikes your back and takes your wealth, then still hear and obey"**. (Bukharee, Muslim and others).

Where are those who wish to incite the people towards their destruction, those rowdy hooligans, whose only wish is to occupy the youth with the iniquities of the rulers? Can there be a more severe and harsh description for a people than having "the hearts of devils in the bodies of men"?!!

And as for the doubts that are used by the Innovators to justify rebellion merely on account of a ruler's tyranny and his lack of applying total Sharee'ah rule, then they have been refuted by the major scholars of today, and these doubts are only employed

by the Kharijite Renegades of today who are upon the extremism of Sayyid Qutb, Suroor and his likes.

And as for when clear, undisputable kufr is observed, with clear proof from Allaah, then this matter is referred back to the Senior Ulamaa who advise – and it is not the case that as soon as clear kufr is observed that rebellion is automatically sanctioned. All of these affairs are greatly serious, since they can have very dangerous consequences. Hence, they are not left to those poisoned with the ideologies we have outlined above, who are the most ignorant of people with respect to the Sunnah and the manhaj of the Salaf. Rather they are referred back to the Ulamaa who are upon a sound creed and a sound manhaj, who will direct the people in the Affair. And the greatest of examples of this is the Algerian Revolution which was actually backed and encouraged by the Puppets of Aal Qutb, the neo-Qutubiyyah of Arabia. The senior scholars like Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz and Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen forbade the people from using violence and resorting to fighting, and advised then to rectify the society with the call to Tawheed and the Sunnah – but as for the neo-Qutubiyyah and those poisoned with the teachings of Qutb and Bannaa, they encouraged and backed the revolution, which has taken 100,000 civilian lives to date.

Ibn al-Qayyim - may Allaah have mercy upon him - said: “This is a great topic, containing much benefit and due to ignorance of this topic a great mistake has fallen upon the Sharee’ah...” up until he said, after mentioning that the basis of the Sharee’ah is built upon the welfare and benefits of the servants: “...The Prophet (sallallaahu ‘alaihi-wasallam) legislated for his ummah, the obligation of rejecting the evil so that by its rejection, the goodness that Allaah and His Messenger love is obtained. And when rejecting the evil leads to what is more evil and more hated by Allaah and His Messenger then it is not allowed to reject it - even if Allaah hates it and detests those who perform it (the evil). **And this is like rejection [inkaar] against the kings, and the ones in authority by coming out against them [with arms etc. to fight them] - for verily, that is the basis and foundation of every evil (sharr) and every tribulation (fitnah) till the end of time.** And the Companions asked permission from the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu ‘alaihi wasallam) for killing the leaders [Umaraa’] who delay the prayer from its proper time, saying: “Shall we not kill them.” So he said: “No, so long as they establish the prayer”, and he also said: “Whoever sees something from his leader [ameer] something that he dislikes then let him be patient and let him not raise his hand [away] from the leader’s obedience.” **And whoever reflects upon the greatest and smallest trials that have befallen Islaam, then he will see that they are due to the negligence and wastage of this principle and the lack of patience upon [witnessing] evil. So he seeks bring about its end and as a result of this, a greater evil is brought about.** And the Messenger (sallallaahu ‘alaihi wasallam) saw the greatest of evils in Makkah and he was not able to change them. In fact even when Allaah opened up for the Muslims Makkah [i.e. gave the Muslims victory over it] and when it became daar ul-Islaam he was resolved to changing the Ka’abah and returning it to the foundations that Ibraaheem (alaihis-salaam) had built it upon - but even though he had the capacity to do that, he was prevented from it by the fear that something

greater would occur due to the lack of tolerance of the Quraish, since they were new to Islaam and had recently left disbelief - and for this reason he did not grant permission for rejecting against the leaders [Umaraa'] with the use of one's hand [i.e. with force] due to the greatness of what results afterwards on account of it..." Ibn al-Qayyim in 'Ilaam ul-Muwaqqi'een an Rabbil-Aalameen.'

However, all of this is rejected by the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah and others from the neo-Kharijites, who see all of this as defeatism and lenience in the da'wah (as first stated by their Sayyid, and then later revived by the brother and acting Minister, Mohammad Qutb, who began the accusation of Irjaa' against Ahl us-Sunnah)! And for this reason it was observed that the Ulamaa who called for obedience to the Rulers in that which was good and forbade rousing the sentiments of the people against them – out of fear of the harmful consequences which actually fall back upon the people – they were labelled “stooges”, “spies”, “paid workers” and the likes.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 7

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

11. What is the breeding ground for khurooj (rebellion)?

The beginning point of the physical khurooj (rebellion) is actually at the theoretical and doctrinal level. Shaikh al-Albaani explains that **“Khurooj is of two types: a) the khurooj in thought and ideology (al-khurooj al-fikri), and this is the most dangerous and b) the physical khurooj which follows on from the first...”** (Refer to Kaifa Nu’aaliju Waaqi’unaa al-Aleem, of Abu Lawz). Hence, those books which, at the doctrinal and theoretical level, sow the seeds for khurooj – like those of Sayyid Qutb, Mawdudi, Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Suroor, Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah – and many others, they are dangerous and should be destroyed and banished. It is for this reason also, that when Imaam al-Albaani, read “Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa” which was thought out and written by the Think Tank of Aal Qutb, in order to entice clear and sincere Salafis into the fold of Qutubism, that he labeled the likes of these people (al-Hawali, al-Awdah, al-Qarnee etc.) as “The Khawaarij of the Era”. This is because, the clear framework for a physical khurooj, was evidently present in the writings and lectures of these people.

The thoughts and ideas of Qutb (of extremism in takfir and haakimiyyah and insignificance to the affairs of Shirk) and those of Hassan al-Bannaa (of total insignificance to major Shirk and Innovation) and of Mawdudi (of extremism in Haakimiyyah and bloody revolutions) and then the transmission of these thoughts through the activities, writings and lectures of the Puppets of Aal Qutb (Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, al-Qarnee, al-‘Umar and others) have created this great imbalance in the da’wah, which has in fact led the Ummah up the wrong road. The only beneficiaries of these types of doctrines are the Infidels themselves, who thrive upon the instability and discord in the Muslim countries, and who but incite it, so that

their own plots and agendas, can be more readily realised. Termination of the da'wah (and we mean here the da'wah upon the manhaj of the Salaf, not the da'wah of Qutubiyyah or Surooriyyah, the activist da'wah), and preventing the da'wah from maturing (in the sense that the populace in general is guided towards the Book and the Sunnah and to Tawheed and the correct Prophetic Methodology), by way of internal discord is only of benefit to the Infidels. Algeria is the perfect example. If the activists of Algeria had listened to the advice of the Imaams of the Sunnah of our times (and then presented it out of sincerity of purpose to the people at large, instead of concealing it), then perhaps there might have been great advancement by today. But when the people try to replace the ruler, or the whole government, by ways and means the Sharee'ah does not sanction, then there is no barakah in that, and great calamities follow.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, "Then these matters (outlined above, concerning ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed) do not mean that when we make takfir of someone that it is (automatically) obligatory to rebel against him, since great evils result from this rebellion – more so than (what results) from remaining silent. We are not able right now to give examples of this from what has occurred within the Ummah, the Arab and Non-Arab (part of it). But when we have verified the correctness of rebellion against this person from the Sharee'ah perspective, then it is vital that preparations be made (in terms of physical strength) such that the strength attained is equivalent to that of the ruler or more than that. But as for the people rebelling with knives and spears while the ruler has tanks and bombs and what is similar to that, then this is but stupidity without doubt, and it is also in opposition to the Sharee'ah." (22/03/1420H, taped discussion with Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri).

Stated al-Hasan al-Basri, "Know – may Allaah pardon you – that the tyranny of the kings is a retribution (niqmah) from among the retributions of Allaah the Most High. And Allaah's retributions are not to be faced with the sword, but they are to be faced with taqwaa and are repelled with supplication and repentance, remorse (inaabah) and abstention from sins. Verily, when the punishments of Allaah are met with the sword, are more severe. And Maalik bin Deenaar narrated to me that al-Hajjaaj (Ibn Yoosuf) used to say, "Know that every time you commit a sin Allaah will bring about a punishment from the direction of your ruler (sultaan)". And I have I have also been told that a person said to al-Hajjaaj, "Do you do such and such with the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallahu alaihi wasallam)?" So he replied, "For the reason that I am the punishment of Allaah upon the people of Iraaq, when they innovated into their religion whatever they innovated, and when they abandoned the commands of the their Prophet – alaihis salaam – whatever they abandoned." (Adaab Hasan al-Basri, of Ibn al-Jawzee, pp.119-120, by way of Mu'aamalat ul-Hukkaam, of Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis).

And these foreign methodologies like Qutubism, Bannaawism, Suroorism, Turaathism, are all concerned with political affairs and the issues of rule and rulership – and over time, they lead to a general climate, in which the exaggerated concepts of takfir and haakimiyyah, start to develop and start to spread, leading to the maturing of

these thoughts in the mind of people, until, full blown Kharijism begins to manifest itself, in small pockets, in different parts of the Ummah. And this is exemplified by the emergence of assassinations, coups, bombings, and the use of deceit and treachery, in order to eradicate evil and this is also exemplified by the emergence of the accusations against the scholars that they are “the paid men of the religion” and “puppets” and the likes, for this the beginning of the separation of the Ummah from its scholars, such that the Activists can lead the people to the desired [doomed] goal. What leads to further confusion is that many of those people who are put to trial with aspects of these ideologies state “we do not believe in rebellion and nor do we call to it”, but this is how Satan has deceived them.

For the innovations (in manhaj) that they are upon will actually lead them and the general populace closer to a physical khurooj. And as was alluded to earlier, innovations begin as something small, with a person never conceiving or believing what will be the end result of this innovation. And the greatest of examples of that is that of those people who Abdullaah Ibn Mas’ood admonished, those who were outside the mosque performing dhikr by counting stones, while sat in circles. They entered into an innovation in worship. Later, they were found dead at Nahrawaan, having fought alongside the Khawaarij against other Muslims. Many of the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah have used this incident to illustrate the effects of innovation upon its people, and the despicable state and end result it leads them to. And as for those in our times, who have become obsessed with the issues of takfir of the rulers, and haakimiyyah and political work and so on – having innovated into the manhaj many affairs, for the realization of their goals, then by Allaah, they do not realize, how they will be tossed and turned in every direction, till they find it is too late, and end up destroying themselves, or destroying others by preaching destructive innovatory orientations to them.

Abu Abdul-Bari’ Abdul-Hamid bin Ahmad al-‘Arabi in ‘Baree us-Saham’ in refutation of the Qutubi, ‘Adnan Ar’oor, said, “And if you are ignorant of the Qutubiyyah – and I do not think that is the case – then come with me that I may give you a small glimpse of them, and this is in reference to the Algerian Qutubis, and the people of Makkah are most familiar with its streets (i.e. the residents of a place are better aware of its people). This astray sect (the Qutubiyyah) appeared in the 80s having been influenced by the tafsir ‘az-Zilal’ which was in those days a revered and precious book– and it has never stopped being so – which competed with the likes of at-Tabari and Ibn Kathir. A specific and very open type of propaganda was made for this book and it was subsequently sold in all the bookshops and was featured in all the national exhibitions until any student who did not have it in his house was not worth anything.

Then after the youth had been filled with the decadence of Sayyid Qutb, existing in his ‘Zilal’ and all of his other writings, the symptoms of disease began to appear from them, bit by bit. They then began to cluster themselves together and this in their view, was their preparation for withdrawing from the society. After this, they abandoned the mosques and performing prayer behind the imaams, those whom they called “imaams

of the state” (hukoomiyyeen), because they were innovators – according to their reasoning – and because they are the imaams who have been arranged by the CCB.

All of this was from the gradual deception of Shaytaan that he may make them fall into that which is even greater and more serious. And hardly months, or a few years had passed until the disease became fully blown and they began to perform takfir of the rulers and anyone attached to them. This disease became rooted in them more and more until it reached its climax, and then they performed takfir of the whole society and anyone found within it.

Then I debated with some of them, amongst those who were in my town and I made clear to them the danger of this ideology, that it only serves the interests of the enemies of this religion. And that this ideology makes the unsuspecting youth to clash with the ruler and as such the objectives of the Jews and Christians are realised, in attacking the Islamic da’wah in its very own lands before it has fully matured. And the greatest evidence of this is what has actually happened [in Algeria]. I then directed them to the books of Shaik ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, his student, Ibn al-Qayyim and all the books of the Salaf. And then they adopted the truth, recanting from their misguidance, and all of this was due to the benevolence of my Lord and praise be to Allaah through whom righteous deeds are completed. And this sect, the Qutubiyyah, has not ceased to remain upon its thought until now, showing loyalty to whoever agrees with it and showing enmity, performing takfir of and murdering – when they are capable of murdering -whoever does not agree with them. And they were at the forefront of the warring factions (jamaa’aat) in Algeria.” End of his words.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 8

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

12. What is the state of the Muslim land in general from the point of view of rule and the affairs of da'wah

There is great diversity between the Muslim land from the point of view of Sharee'ah rule, and the extent and scope of the da'wah to Tawheed and the Sunnah upon the Prophetic Methodology.

We differentiate between them on the basis of the strength and maturity of the da'wah to Tawheed and the Sunnah, and the existence of Sharee'ah Laws, and the presence of those who rule by them, either in smaller or greater amounts (bearing in mind that some of the leaders have been declared apostate by our Ulamaa, such as Qadafi and Saddaam). We differentiate between all of them to such an extent that we arrive at numerous categories of countries, in which different conditions, observations and analyses apply. We do not treat Syria like Saudi Arabia. Nor Egypt like Kuwait. Nor Turkey(!!) to the Emirates and nor Libya(!!) to Pakistan. It is important that we make a distinction between all of them in this way!! So each of the Muslim lands have differing degrees and elements of Tawheed, Sunnah, Sharee'ah rule, Shirk, Bid'ah, Tasawwuf, Secularism, Communism, Socialism, and so on. With some being closer to Tawheed and the Sunnah with aspects of Sharee'ah rule and others being further away from that.

We do not treat them all in the same manner, and we see that in some of these lands, we see the most stubborn and obstinate opposition to Islaam and its adherents, such as in Turkey and Libya, whereas in other countries we see elements of tyranny and oppression, which are not necessarily driven by hatred or aversion to Islaam, in principle, but other factors involving sin (fisq) and oppression (dhulm) and the likes.

And Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, the Atharis are the most just of people, and so they treat what occurs of fisq (sinfulness) as fisq, and what occurs of dhulm, as dhulm, and what occurs of kufr as kufr – in opposition to the straying, wandering, sentimentalist scavengers, who prey upon the ignorance and emotions of the people, and lead them to believe that what occurs of fisq and dhulm is actually kufr.

And on this basis, we say that the da'wah that is required in each country varies. And all of that must be performed upon the dictates of the Book, the Sunnah and Salafiyyah, not the dictates of Bid'ah, Qutubiyyah and Khaarijiyyah [‘Asriyyah].

Further, in most of these countries there are “activist” movements who attempt, either by way of plotting revolutions, or by going through the democratic process, by way of “Islamic parties”, attempt to establish the rule of Allaah in that land!! In these very same countries, the land is rife with the major Shirk, with tombs, mausoleums, saint worship and the likes. These people are but advancing to a mirage, thinking they can achieve what they will never achieve – unless they traverse upon the Prophetic Methodology in calling to Allaah.

Likewise there are those whose sole concern is to demonstrate the kufr of some of the leading figureheads in government of each country, or to demonstrate the kufr of the state, and then to present this to the people, in order to mobilise them towards bloody revolutions, or with organised overthrows, or “shurocratic activity” (involvement in parliamentary elections) and the likes. And all of this is error and misguidance and is far removed from the Prophetic methodology in the rectification of societies and nations.

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan said, “So these people wish to establish the Islaamic State before purifying the lands of idolatrous beliefs which take the form of worship of the dead, and devotion to the tombs - such as is no different to the worship of al-Laat, al-Uzzaa and the third of them Manaata, rather it is worse. **So they are attempting that which is impossible...**” (Introduction to ‘Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa’ of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee).

So in short, the Muslim lands vary greatly, but what is required in all of them is the call to Tawheed and Sunnah and eradication of the affairs of major Shirk and the affairs of Innovation, and encouraging the people upon Birr and Taqwaa thereafter and striving in that so that the assistance and the promise made by Allaah is brought to realisation. This is the only basis of rectification. As for the foreign and alien ways and methodologies, then they are doomed to fail, and only lead to further destruction.

It must also be said, that sometimes, those affected by the destructive calls (like Qutubism, Bannaawism, Turaathism, Suroorism), do have their share of inviting to Tawheed and to the Sunnah and the likes of these affairs. Nevertheless they are still tainted with aspects of these foreign, innovatory ideologies, and the danger is that, since Allaah guides and misguides, they may continue to drown further and further into these ideologies, becoming engrossed in them and with them, till they end up in

pure misguidance and error. And this is the way of all of innovation, since it begins as something small, resembling the truth, appealing and beautified, and then over time, it leads its person to utter misguidance – as has been explained by Imaam al-Barbahaaree in the opening pages of his Sharh us-Sunnah.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 9

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

13. What about the Saudi state?

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan said: “The Saudi state ever since it began has always aided the religion and its adherents. And it was not founded except upon this basis. And whatever it does at the moment in spending material wealth to support Muslims in every place, setting up centres and mosques, sending du’at (to other countries), printing books – at the forefront of which is the Noble Qur’an –, opening centres of learning and faculties of knowledge, and its judging by the Islamic Shari’ah (Tahkeemuhaa lish-Sharee’at il-Islaamiyyah), and also setting up a separate body for enjoining the good and forbidding the evil in every city – then all of this is a clear and evident proof of it’s aid to Islam and its adherents. **And this is thorn (shajiyyun, lit. grievance, distress) in the throats of the people of hypocrisy (Ahl un-Nifaq) and the people of evil and dissension (Shiqaq). And Allaah is the Aider of His religion even if the pagans and the biased partisans may detest it.**

And we do not say that this state is perfect from every single aspect and that it does not have any mistakes. Mistakes occur by every single person and we ask Allaah that he helps this state in correcting its mistakes. **But if this person (who makes such a claim) was to look at his own self, he would find mistakes that would prevent his tongue from speaking about others and make him feel ashamed of looking at others.”** (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah p.117)

There is no country on the face of this earth whose population at large is upon Tawheed, on a collective level. In Saudi, the Salafi aqeedah is taught in the schools, colleges, institutions and universities. There are no graves or grave worship, and no

tombs or mausoleums and the affairs of innovation are not like the affairs of innovation in other countries such as Egypt or Syria or Pakistan or Afghanistan, Sudan and the likes. It is upon the aqeedah of Imaam Ahmad, Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab. It is not possible to compare any other country with Saudi from this perspective – and this is only denied by a partisan whose heart has been blackened with the evil effects of Innovation. And there is no doubt that the absence of such Shirk and Innovation, has brought great blessings to this country and great favours not bestowed upon other countries, in terms of wealth and security and sanctity.

Further, the Sharee'ah is established and the hudood are applied, and though there are deficiencies and shortcomings and the presence of non-Islamic laws, this does not negate the great goodness in this country. As for the rulers and the government, then the position towards them is a Sharee'ah position and the position of the Ulamaa of that country, the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen (rahimahumullaah), Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others, all of whom see obedience to the rulers and assisting them and advising them and enjoining the good and forbidding the evil – in the Sharee'ah manner – and maintaining the sanctity and security of the land by not creating civil disobedience and revolts and the likes. And as for the sinfulness or oppression of the Rulers, then rulers have passed who were greater in their sinfulness and disobedience – and indeed there were those who imposed sayings of kufr upon the people, and butchered multitudes of the leading scholars for the sake of sayings of kufr – and alongside that, no one raised a hand against them, and likewise there were those who fell into drinking of alcohol, and fornication, and also slaughter of the Muslims (and even some of the Companions) and other such major sins and crimes and evils.

The Shaikh and Imaam, Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan bin Hasan Aal Shaikh - may Allaah have mercy upon them all - said, in powerful words that uncover the confusing doubts in this topic and that refute the one who spreads them from amongst the ignoramuses: **“... And those people - those who are under trial - do not know that with the exception of Umar bin Abdul-Azeez and whoever Allaah willed from among the Bane Umayyah - great mishaps, insolence, taking up arms [against the people] and corruption occurred from most of those in charge [wullaat] of the people of Islaam from the time of Yazeed bin Mu'aawiyah [till the present]. But along with that, the manner and behaviour of the notable scholars and mighty leaders with the rulers is well-known and renowned - they do not raise a hand against giving obedience in that which Allaah and His Messenger have commanded from among the legislated actions and obligatory duties of Islaam.**

And I will give you an example - that of al-Hajjaaj bin Yoosuf ath-Thaqafei, and his affair is well known in the ummah - that of oppression, repression, excessiveness in spilling the blood [of the Muslims], desecration of the Sanctities of Allaah, the killing of whomever he killed amongst the notables of the ummah such as Sa'eed bin Jubair, the besieging of Ibn az-Zubair even though he had sought refuge in the

Haram, and making lawful the sacred and sanctified, the killing of Ibn az-Zubair - even though Ibn az-Zubair had given obedience to him and the people of Makkah, Medinah, Yemen, and most of Iraaq had given the pledge of allegiance to him [Ibn az-Zubair] and al-Hajjaaj was only a deputy of Marwaan, and then of his son Abdul-Malik and none of the khulafaa' (successors) had given Marwaan a pledge and none of the influential people, those with power had given the pledge of allegiance to him. And along with all of this none of the People of Knowledge hesitated in obeying him and complying with him in that in which obedience is permissible from amongst the pillars of Islaam and its obligations.

And Ibn 'Umar and whoever met al-Hajjaaj were from amongst the Companions of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam), and they never contested with him and nor did they prevent obedience to him in that by which Islaam is established and by which Eemaan is perfected. And it is likewise for those who were also in the era of al-Hajjaaj from among the taab'ieen such as Ibn al-Musayyib, al-Hasan al-Basree, Ibn Seereen, Ibraaheem at-Taimee and those like them from among the leaders of the ummah.

And the affair continued like this between the leading scholars of the ummah - they would enjoin obedience to Allaah and His Messenger and making jihaad in His path along with every leader [imaam] whether righteous or sinful, as is well known in the books of the fundamental principles and beliefs of the religion.

And similarly, Banu al-'Abbaas, they conquered the lands of the Muslims forcefully, with the sword - and not one of the People of Knowledge and Religion aided them in that - and they killed hordes of people and many of the creation from among the Banu Umayyah, their leaders and their deputies. And they killed Ibn Hubairah, the ameer of Iraaq and they also killed Marwaan, the khaleefah - and it was reported that the murderers killed around eighty people from the Banu Umayyah in a single day - and then they placed their blankets above the corpses, sat upon them and then called for food and drink.

So along with all of that the conduct of the leading scholars - such as al-'Awzaa'ee, Maalik, al-Layth ibn Sa'd, 'Ataa bin Abee Rabaah - with those kings is not hidden from the one who has a share in knowledge and realisation. And then next generation of the People of Knowledge such as Ahmad bin Hanbal, Muhammad bin Ismaa'eel, Muhammad bin Idrees, Ahmad bin Nooh, Ishaq bin Raahawaih and their brothers ... their occurred in their time what occurred from the kings of the great innovations and the denial of the Sifaat and they were called to [affirm] these things and were put to trial by them] and whoever was killed, was killed such as Ahmad bin Nasr. But along with all of this it is not known

that a single one of them raised his hand against obedience [to those kings] and that he saw fit to attack them..." Ad-Durar as-Sunniyyah fil Ajwibat un-Najdiyyah (7/177-178).

And all of this indicates that the state and condition of Saudi, with its scholars and rulers and whatever it contains of goodness, is not worse than the many situations and circumstances found in the Muslim lands, in the history of the Ummah – times and situations which saw excessive killing, confiscation of wealth, the violation of the sanctities of Allaah, the absence of adherence to the Book and the Sunnah, the spread and imposition of beliefs and statements of kufr and what is similar to these affairs.

But alongside all that it is important to note that there are no rulers today who are like 'Umar Ibn al-Khattaab, and nor Umar Ibn Abdul-Azeez, and nor like many of the great leaders of the past. For the rulers of today are worlds apart from those of the past. However, the position with all of them regardless, of how pious, or how tyrannical and sinful, is a Sharee'ah position, which has been outlined above, and this is manifestly clear in the books of aqeedah.

As for the Kharijite Renegades, and the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Turaathiyyah, the Azzaamites and their likes, they hate all of this (clarification) since it goes against their agenda. And it is for this reason you see them striving their hardest to break away the youth from the books of the Salaf of the past, those in which the creed of Ahl us-Sunnah is contained, and in which rebellion against the sinful, tyrannical oppressive rulers is forbidden, by consensus, after established textual evidence. So they say, "the books of the Salaf are dry, they only contain texts and rulings" and "those books were written for a time other than ours", and "those books contain many complexities which put off the students of knowledge" and other such affairs which have been stated by Mohammad Suroor and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq. And what they mean by this is that we should read the contemporary books, such as those of Sayyid Qutb, Mawdudi, and those which raise high the banner and conceptual slogans of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi, "social justice" and "al-haakimiyyah" and which call for khurooj (rebellion) or which lay the intellectual and doctrinal foundations for it – and all of these affairs lead to destruction, not rectification.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 10

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 14: There is much talk of Afghanistan as an Islamic State?

This affair (of it being an Islamic state) is for the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah to decide, those scholars who are clearly Salafi in their aqeedah and manhaj – and not the sentimentalists who are upon the da'wah of Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah and who are the quickest in showing allegiance to the Innovators, and enmity against the Salafis, based not upon what Allaah has revealed concerning His Names and His Attributes and what is due to him of Tawheed and Ibaadah, and obedience to the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), but based upon the narrow, restricted Haakimiyyah which has become the superglue for all neo-Kharijites and Innovators.

Firstly, the Taliban are Maatureedee, Deobandite, Muqallid Hanafites, with grave-worship and innovation in their midst. During their taking over of Afghanistan (which is still not complete), they did not strive to cleanse the land from idolatrous beliefs, practices of Shirk, and nor rooting out innovations. Nor did they make judgement be to Allaah and His Messenger in the affairs of Ittibaa' (following the Messenger in all affairs and judging to his Sunnah). What has been reported by the trustworthy Salafi Shaikhs of Pakistan is that they have shown aversion to the Salafi da'wah, by closing down some of the institutions that called to the Book and the Sunnah, and have belittled and defamed the Salafis by labelling them "ghayr muqallideen" and the likes.

Secondly, the manhaj of Taliban is not the manhaj of the Salaf, and they did not establish their domination over the land upon the Prophetic Methodology outlined in the Book and the Sunnah, that which is based upon the establishment of Tawheed first and foremost. As for the great frenzy that occurred when the idols of Buddah were smashed, then though this a praiseworthy and commendable act, it would have been

more appropriate to demolish all the tombs and to end the grave-worship (since that is mentioned in the wording of the very same hadeeth, before the mention of idols being smashed), and to establish the laws of apostasy upon the Mushriks, after having invited them to Tawheed – just as the initiator of the Afghani Jihaad, Shaikh Jameel ur-Rahmaan had done over a decade ago, having established a mini Islamic state, upon the da'wah to Tawheed, with the hudood established, being aided in all of that by Allaah the Most High – and who was subsequently murdered by a coalition of the Innovators and power-hungry wolves amongst the Heretics and diseased partisans. We would say that the Islamic State that was set up by Shaikh Jameel ur-Rahmaan was a true Islamic State, built upon the Prophetic Methodology, since he purified the land from idolatry, grave-worship and made judgement to what Allaah has revealed, in aqeedah and ibaadah, and tawheed and ittibaa', and social dealings and punishment and the likes. So even though it was only in a small region (Kunar), it was an Islamic State – because it was built upon the right foundations.

And as for what the Talibaan have achieved, of domination over almost all of the land, upon other than the Manhaj of Nubuwwah – whilst beliefs and practices of major Shirk are in their midst - then it is for the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah to decide the correct viewpoint towards it, in light of the facts. What have the Talibaan achieved?

From a statement of one of their officials:

- a) physical occupation and control of the land
- b) the re-unification of their land,
- c) disarming the population (from weapons and ammunitions)
- d) set up a single administration
- e) scaling down the opium industry
- f) restored basic human rights
- g) controlling or subduing the war-lords.

All of this is based up what was stated by Sayyid Rahmatullaah Haashimi, a Taliban Ambassador, recently (March 2001) in his satellite interview from Kandahar and broadcast in the US media. Indeed, the Taliban were actually driven to overtake the country because of some brutal murders of some girls that had taken place, and not because of the repugnant Shirk and Innovation that plagued their land. As for purifying the land from the mires of Shirk and Innovation, then that still needs to be addressed. The Taliban removed the physical oppression of violence and lawlessness, and attempted to create more sanctity and security for the Afghani people. But they did not remove Shirk, the greatest oppression, on account of which they would actualise true security and sanctity.

O my son, do not associate partners with Allaah (in your beliefs and worship), for verily Shirk is the greatest dhulm (oppression). Surah Luqman 31:13

Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan (true faith and belief) and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those before them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors.
Soorah an-Noor 24:55

In fact, the great excitement in activist circles in relation to Taliban and Afganistan, and their lauding and applauding of it (as they had lauded and applauded Bashir and Turabi's Sudan, as an Islamic State), has only illustrated their two-faces, and their great hypocrisy in the issue of ruling by what Allaah has revealed. Do the Taliban rule by what Allaah has revealed in what pertains to the actual right of Allaah from the affairs of Tawheed? And do they judge by what Allaah has revealed in what pertains to the right of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)? And where are those deluded partisans who raise high the saying of Allaah, **"But no, by your Lord, they can have no Faith, until they make you (O Muhammad) judge in all disputes between them, and find in themselves no resistance against your decisions, and accept (them) with full submission."** (an-Nisaa 4:65), using it to make takfir and judge with apostasy, those who do not judge by what Allaah has revealed in the social dealings between men and the governance of the state?! So where are they in the face of those who do not make Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), fundamentally, the judge in the affairs of Ittibaa? And where are they in the face of those who do not judge by what Allaah has revealed with respect to the right of Allaah, in knowledge of Him and worship of Him?

And does failing to rule by **whatever** Allaah has revealed only apply to rulers, or does it apply to **whomever** does not rule by what Allaah has revealed. And does it apply only to social dealings, or does it apply also to what relates to Allaah the Most High, and His rights in knowledge and action?

And all of this shows that the biased partisans are but tossed in all different directions, by wave upon wave of innovation, driven by hizbiyyah and pushed forward by sentiment – and they have no sound principles or knowledge-based foundations upon which they traverse, and upon which they hold their positions and their understanding of the Book and the Sunnah is not upon the manhaj of the Salaf, rather it is upon whatever their hizbiyyah necessitates. And it also proves once more, that their call to Haakimiyyah is a politicised, innovated one, and not an all-inclusive, comprehensive one.

In addition, Sa'eed bin Jubair said, "That my son accompanies a sinful and cunning scoundrel who is a Sunni is more beloved to me than that he accompanies a devoutful and worshipful Innovator." (al-Ibaanah no. 89). Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee (d. 204H) said:

“That a person meets Allaah with every sin except Shirk is better than meeting Him upon any one of the innovated beliefs.” (Reported by al-Bayhaqee in al-I’tiqaad p.158). Yunus bin Ubaid said to his son, “I forbid you from fornication (zinaa), stealing and drinking wine. However that you meet Allaah with any of these sins is better to me than that you meet him with the view of Amr bin Ubaid and the associates of Amr (i.e. the Mu’tazilah).” (al-Ibaanah 2/466). And what exactly are the beliefs and practices of the Deobandite, Maatureedee Hanafites but rejection of the Attributes of Allaah Most High, and repugnant Tasawwuf? Hence, loyalty and disownment is based around Tawheed and the Sunnah and the Aqeedah of the Salaf. Not around the establishment of the hudood and the governance of a state, fundamentally. This is the manhaj of the Salaf and this is the manhaj of al-walaa wal-baraa’ (loyalty and disownment) known to the Salaf. As for the Innovators, those in our times who are the Extremist Murji’ah of our times, from the point of view of their da’wah, then they are far removed from our Salaf, and their manhaj of al-walaa wal-baraa’ is plagued with repugnant Irjaa’.

Having said all of that, we still pray that the Taalibaan are granted success in correcting and reforming their land, not just from the point of view of the social dealings between the people and the operation of the state, but from the point of view of ruling by what Allaah has revealed in Aqeedah, and Tawheed, and Ittibaa’, in addition to the affairs of social dealings. And we pray for the Afghani people, who have suffered much and toiled much over the decades – that Allaah provides them a way out and guides them to that which will effect his assistance and aid, if Allaah wills.

Verily, We sent Nûh (Noah) to his people (Saying): “Warn your people before there comes to them a painful torment.” He said: “O my people! Verily, I am a plain warner to you, “That you should worship Allâh (Alone), be dutiful to Him, and obey me, “He (Allâh) will forgive you of your sins and respite you to an appointed term. Verily, the term of Allâh when it comes, cannot be delayed, if you but knew.” He said: “O my Lord! Verily, I have called my people night and day (i.e. secretly and openly to accept the doctrine of Islâmic Monotheism), “But all my calling added nothing but to (their) flight (from the truth). “And verily! Every time I called unto them that You might forgive them, they thrust their fingers into their ears, covered themselves up with their garments, and persisted (in their refusal), and magnified themselves in pride. “Then verily, I called to them openly (aloud); “Then verily, I proclaimed to them in public, and I have appealed to them in private, “I said (to them): ‘Ask forgiveness from your Lord; Verily, He is Oft-Forgiving; ‘He will send rain to you in abundance; ‘And give you increase in wealth and children, and bestow on you gardens and bestow on you rivers.’” (Nuh 71:1-12)

So we ask Allaah, that he grants the Taalibaan success in calling with the call of the Messengers, and inviting the people to Tawheed, such that Allaah opens up the skies for them, and sends down rain in abundance and gives them increase in wealth, and makes them self-sufficient, and removes the fear and poverty, and replaces it with sanctity and security. Provided that they worship Him alone and not associate

partners with him. And we call upon Ahl us-Sunnah in the various regions of the Earth, to send the books of Shaikh Badee' ud-Deen as-Sindee and those of Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab (Kitaab ut-Tawheed, Thalaathat Usool, Kashf ush-Shubuhaat, al-Qawaa'id al-Arab'ah) and those of Imaam Ibn Baaz and others who have written extensively on Tawheed and explained its realities to the Taalibaan, and to encourage them upon the likes of these affairs and to educate and nurture the people upon the likes of these affairs. For that is the road to true success and strength and might and honour. And it is upon the Taalibaan to fear Allaah with respect to their people, and for them to begin the true rectification of their society, by the rectification of their beliefs and practices, and to show loyalty and disownment based upon this, and to separate between the people based upon this.

But in the absence of all of that, the basis for loyalty and disownment (walaah and baraa) [towards the Taalibaan and other than them] remains, and it is based upon aqeedah and tawheed and ittibaa' and the Salafi manhaj, fundamentally – and emotions and sentiments do not approach it at all, by Allaah's permission. And all of this shows that the people of truth are those who remain firm upon the Straight Path of Allaah, that which the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) drew in the sand, as a straight line, not being tossed to and fro and being shaken from side to side, by mere emotions and sentiments and frenzies. It is those who judge everything by what Allaah has revealed, first and foremost, in that which relates to the Self of Allaah and His Names and His Attributes – since that is the greatest of all affairs, then in that which relates to Him of worship, and then in what relates to His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), in what relates to him of Ittibaa' – as a principle – and in what relates to the judgements of rulings of Islaam in general – and who refer every matter back to the likes of these affairs – and who remain firm upon that, they are the successful ones, upon whom Allaah will send down victory – by His permission, and they are the most perceptive ones of the affairs of the creation and of the manner in which Allaah operates with respect to His creation, and of His Sunan.

And whoever understands what has been mentioned above, will come to realise the folly of many of the diseased and biased partisans from amongst the Qutubites, Suroorites, Azzaamites and others, who assault many from Ahl us-Sunnah and accuse them of being “stooges” and “agents”, merely because they (Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis) identify Saudi Arabia in general as being the place where Tawheed, the Islamic aqeedah and manhaj is to be found to be uppermost – in most of the affairs – as opposed to any other country in the world. So then they, the diseased partisans, take some of the iniquities of the rulers, and some of the sin and disobedience that exists such as usury (ribaah'), fornication, drinking and the likes, and then strongly hint that istihlaal (making them lawful) of these actions has been made, and then insinuate kufr and apostasy on account of this, in the strongest of ways – and based upon all of this, they claim that anyone who praises or commends what is found in Saudi Arabia in general of the sound Islamic aqeedah, Tawheed, lack of Innovation and Shirk, enjoining the good and forbidding the evil, the many gatherings of knowledge with the Scholars and so on – that they are stooges and agents!!

And all of this indicates and exposes the way of the Murji'ah in calling to Allaah, for the likes of these groups that have emerged, the Qutubiyyah, the Surooriyyah, the Turaathiyyah, the Bannaawiyyah, the Azzaamiyyah and others, they are all Murji'ah with the Innovators, and their da'wah is representative of Irjaa' to the Innovators and showing loyalty and disownment for their sake, and praising and aggrandising them and raising their affair, and assisting the Innovators against Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis – as was the manhaj of Abdullaah Azzaam in Afghanistan, and which is in fact the way of all those who have become poisoned by the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Mawdudi.

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah observed, “And in the face of those who perform takfir in falsehood are a people who do not know the aqidah of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah as it truly should be known, or they know some of it but are ignorant of some of it. Yet whatever they do know of it, they do not always explain it to the people but conceal it. **And they do not forbid the innovations that oppose the Book and the Sunnah, nor do they rebuke the People of Innovations and neither do they punish them. In fact, they may even criticise absolutely any talk of the Sunnah and the fundamental principles of the religion [i.e. Tawhid etc.]. Or they may accommodate everyone, with all their varying madhhabs... This approach has overcome many of the Murji'ah, some of the Jurists, Sufis and Philosophers.** And both of these two approaches (i.e. that of the Takfiris and the Murji'ah and those with them) are deviant, and outside the [confines of the] Book and the Sunnah.” Majmu' ul-Fatawa (16/427)

And all of this illustrates the true nature of the diseased partisans who have emerged in recent decades, who hate that there should be any talk of the Tawheed of the Messengers (as opposed to their Kharijite notions of Tawheed) and of the Usool of the Sunnah– especially when it entails the refutation and exposition of those for whom they have shown loyalty and allegiance to from amongst the Innovating Heretics (such as Sayyid Qutb, or Hassan al-Banna, or the Taalibaan, and Bashir and Turaabi's Sudan) and so on.

By, Allaah what utter misguidance and blindness to the truth!!



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 11

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 15: What about Saudi and the Gulf-War?

The issue of the Gulf War is an important one as far as the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah is concerned, because this event was responsible for precipitating the calls (da'wahs) of the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Turaathiyyah and Bannaawiyyah and giving them an even more tangible representation than before – at least to Ahl us-Sunnah, the Ahl ul-Hadeeth wal-Athar, who prior to this time, were not really focused upon the machinations of the Qutubiyyah, Bannaawiyyah and the Surooriyyah. Hence, this event was important as far as the worldly affairs of the Muslims were concerned and also as far as the issues connected to manhaj and the state and condition of the da'wah were concerned. All of these were linked and it is important to understand all of this well.

The Gulf War was one of the greatest of calamities to befall the Muslim lands – and there is no Muslim who does not feel remorse and sorrow at what has occurred of the killing of innocent Muslims and the destruction of their worldly affairs and the beginning of separation, differing, and hatred amongst Muslims.

In order to truly give a comprehensive answer we have to make a reminder of one or two issues. Firstly, it is important to recall that following the failure of Qutubism and Bannaawism in places like Egypt and Syria and following the great turmoils that appeared in those lands – those of persecution, tyranny and oppression by the state once it became clear to the state that the Islamic activists were headed towards revolution – following all of this, many of the Ikhwanite figureheads fled and sought refuge in the Saudi Kingdom. The seventies and early eighties saw the influx of Qutubi and Bannaawi elements into Saudi Arabia. The most important of these elements were

Mohammad Qutb, the brother of Sayyid Qutb and Mohammad Suroor, a former Ikhwani. This was the beginnings of the setting up of the “Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine”, which through the eighties would influence some of the youth and populist callers by the teachings of Sayyid Qutb, Hassan al-Bannaa and Mawdudi, those of takfir, haakimiyyah and revolution. The Salafi Mashaayikh in general were unaware that the Faculty of Qutubism and Suroorism was actually in operation during this time – at least not until the 90s or after the 90s after Suroor had actually revealed his true colours to some of the Scholars and after the Gulf War uncovered this School of Thought.

The Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine enrolled the likes of Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, Nasir al-‘Umar, al-Qarnee, and others and infused both Ikhwanite concept and agenda into their minds. The agenda was a steady development towards the initiation of an overthrow. Many people are not actually aware of this, until even many of those who, after the Gulf War, got put to trial by the da’wah of the neo-Qutubiyyah are not actually aware of this. Many people think that the likes of Safar and Salman are the figureheads of this movement, **whereas in reality they are mere puppets**. The actual string-pullers are the likes of Mohammad Suroor, Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Abduh and Mohammad al-Ahmari (the latter two are from Muntada al-Islamee), Muhammad Ahmad Raashid and many others who are behind the scenes and who are not known due to great secrecy of the Suroorist [Cultist] movement.

In general the Qutubi Suroori School of Doctrine would excel (or feign excellence) in the field of current affairs, and would use that in order to portray to the common masses that they are true leaders of the Ummah and are the actual theoreticians who can revive the Ummah, and that they – as opposed to the Scholars – are the ones who truly know what is happening around the globe, whereas the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah, such as those of Saudi, are “scholars of women’s menses and impurities” and the “dollar scholars” and the “scholars of parchments” and other such statements of belittlement and mockery. In addition to that the School of Doctrine would also lay the intellectual and operational foundations for the gathering of people, from different backgrounds, regardless of orientation and belief, for the purpose of realising its agenda. Hence, their da’wah was not allowed to be “exclusivist” and such general terminology and modes of da’wah had to be used that regardless of background, many people could be accommodated. This of course, is neo-Bannaawism. Appeal to the masses was the name of the game, the understanding of current affairs was the stairway to fame, the scholars were to be brought down by rebuke and blame, and an organized overthrow was the overall aim. And thus did the League of Iblis amongst the Innovating Heretics finally find their way to the stage.

It is important to bear all this in mind before we actually come to the issue of the Gulf War, because the Gulf War was the ideal opportunity for the Qutubi, Suroori da’wah to come out in the open, with a no holds barred attitude. By this time, Suroor had cleverly got tazkiyaat (commendations) from the Scholars for his organisation (Al-Muntada al-Islamee), which would later become the reference point for the Suroori da’wah. By deceiving the people with his tazkiyaat he managed to get a large following,

and once that had been achieved, the moment was ideal to reveal his true colours. While initially making his magazine called “as-Sunnah” appear as one that discusses issues of the Salafi creed and manhaj – of course as a bait – when he caught the fish, it later subsequently turned into the political mouthpiece for the Qutubite, Suroorite Agenda.

Hence, his hijrah to the lands of the Kuffaar and his establishing of Kharijite activities (on the intellectual and operational front) with the aid of Mohammad Abduh, in the setting up of al-Muntada al-Islaami, the global organisational front for this da’wah, otherwise known as the Muntadite Lodge of Suroorism. From another angle, all of what has preceded of the discussion of the setting up of this School of Doctrine (in Saudi), reveals how the Gulf War would later help “precipitate” this da’wah – albeit in an accidental way, as far as the Qutubiyyah were concerned - and also bring this movement out in the open so that it can be visibly observed.

Incidentally, in the early eighties, Muhammad Suroor had enrolled Salman al-Awdah into his Jamaa’ah and Salman al-Awdah learned and imbibed “revolutionary modes of thought” after studying the books of Muhammad Suroor which outlined “the Methodology of the Khawaarij in Calling to Allaah”. We know this because some of the Kuwaiti (Salafi) Mashaayikh were actually with Salman al-Awdah in all of this, but Allaah saved them at the hands of Ahl us-Sunnah. Also Mohammad Qutb’s entry in Saudi Arabia, would also see in later years, the studentship of Safar al-Hawali, and Salman al-Awdah and Nasir al-‘Umar and others under him, through which they would further imbibe the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb. This was “the Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine” in full force. The nature of the effects of this School of Doctrine, and the great seriousness in all of this, would only be revealed much after the Gulf War, when the Salafi ‘Ulamaa launched “the Qutubi Inquisition”.

Coming back to the Gulf War.

The Iraqi Regime, at its head Saddaam Hussain, a Ba’thist Communist – who was declared an apostate by Imaam Ibn Baaz in the early 70s – had been supported and was in cahoots with the Kuffaar, USA and Britain – who had helped and supported him in power in the late 60s and through the 70s and 80s. Many people forget the likes of these things and forget the true nature of Saddaam Hussain and his links with the Kuffaar. Indeed, he was honoured by Great Britain and was a close friend and ally to them, having made visits to this country on numerous occasions, receiving support and assistance from them for his war against Iraan and against his own people. They forget that he was a tyrant who had butchered many of his own people with many atrocities, being supported in all of that by the Kuffaar.

In the Gulf War Saddaam Hussain invaded Kuwait, being enticed into that, on account of oil price disputes – and it is apparent that the Infidels brought about this move to allow them to achieve their aims. When he invaded Kuwait, his army took the wealth of the Muslims unjustly, they killed Muslims unjustly, and they took from them as if they were taking the booty from disbelievers in battle. The army of the Ba’thi Apostate

also raped and pillaged, such that they raped the mother in front of the daughter, and the daughter in front of the mother and so on. And this is corroborated – not by the Kuffar media – but by some of the reliable and trustworthy Mashaayikh of Kuwait. So the army attacked the Kuwaiti people, as if they were disbelievers, and as if they (the Kuwaiti people) were booty for them.

All of this led the Kuwaiti Muslims and also the Saudi's to seek assistance from the Kuffaar – after seeking advice from the scholars and after the scholars themselves looked into the affairs of Islaam and the permissibility of doing such an action – So they looked to see if the Deen allowed it, whether it was going to bring a greater harm or good – so then they came to their ijtihaad. There is no sensible Muslim who will reason that the Kuwaiti and Saudi request to the Kuffaar for assistance was in order to wipe out and murder innocent civilians and Muslims in Iraq. No reasonable person will claim that – and indeed only a Kharijite Renegade or a diseased partisan or an entrenched Qutubi or Suroori will claim that. No sensible person will reason that it was the intention of the Kuwaiti and Saudi states to wipe out the Iraqi Muslims – even though the end result of the tribulation was that the Iraqi people suffered greatly, and whatever Allaah, the Most Wise, wills indeed occurs. And of course, it is a sad state of affairs, that there was no capable Muslim army, that was available in order to do what the Kuffaar had originally been called in for.

So the Kuwaiti and Saudis sought assistance from the Kuffaar. As for the Ulamaa (of Saudi) then they ruled that seeking aid from the Kuffaar to repel the onset of the Ba'thi (Communist, Marxist) apostate and his army was permissible and they specified the necessary conditions – that the Muslims be in charge, and that the period of stay of the Kuffaar armies is not indefinite. And these were laid down by the 'Ulamaa, and they gave this verdict, seeing the necessity of receiving help, out of fear of the onset of a Ba'thi apostate and his army, and out of the lack of any Muslim army who had the power or the will to aid the Muslims unilaterally to repel Saddam Hussain.

So the Kuffaar were invited like a security guard is employed and paid to fulfil a specified task – and there is no doubt that the Kuffaar themselves had aims and objectives, which was to destroy Iraq as a regional superpower, after having helped to build it, albeit for their own objectives. And as for what had transpired of the bombing of Iraq, its utter destruction, and the killing of the Iraqi people, then no doubt, it was a crime and an evil – and all of that was in the interests of the Kuffaar who had more or less achieved their goals. Again, there is no sensible person, who will attribute the intent to kill the Iraqi people to either the 'Ulamaa who gave the verdict so as to repel the aggression of Saddam Hussain and his army, or to the Rulers. No one, who looks at the facts, and the way matters transpired, will come to this conclusion – for the intent is something in the heart and none knows that but Allaah – but no sensible person will claim that the either the Rulers, or the Scholars who issued the verdict, intended by it, to wipe out the Iraqi people.

Following the war, some of the Kuffaar remained, and to this day they remain, although after the repulsion of Saddaam Hussain's forces from Kuwait, most of the

foreign Kuffaar troops, brought into fight, left. As far as the Ulamaa are concerned, in their verdict, they specified the conditions for seeking assistance, amongst them that the stay of the Kuffar is not indefinite and is for the duration for the repelling of the aggression of Saddaam Hussain and his army. The Rulers – fearing the threat of another reprisal from Saddaam, decided to let some of the troops remain – and so they remain to this day.

The actual outcomes of the Gulf War were not conducive to the Qutubite Agenda [which was being planned during the eighties in the Faculty of Khurooj, in the Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine, at the hands of the Kharijite Intelligentsia such as Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Suroor, Mohammad Abduh and others, as is manifestly clear from their writings]. And the outcomes of this war actually came in the way of the goals of the Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah who had been planning a secret overthrow. The timing for their activity was around the time when the Gulf War occurred, or during it. However, when matters did not turn out the way the Qutubiyyah wanted them to, this somewhat derailed their plan and agenda. And the explanation of that is as follows:

At the onset of the Gulf War, the Qutubiyyah, chief amongst them Safar al-Hawaali, first of all portrayed the issue of the Gulf War as an actual military occupation of Saudi Arabia. Whereas the matter to the 'Ulamaa was one of repelling Saddaam by seeking foreign assistance, the Qutubiyyah portrayed the whole affair as one of military occupation of the land. This was to enable them to help mobilise the youth and to portray to them that their land had been occupied, just like Palestine had at the hands of the Brethren of Apes and Pigs. A great deal of exaggeration was made in this regard and the youth were nurtured upon sentiment and emotion and to have evil opinions of the Major 'Ulamaa (such as Imaam Ibn Baaz (rahimahullaah)), who had given the ruling of the permissibility of seeking assistance. This was to be the beginnings of the accusations that would later emerge from the Qutubiyyah that the Salafi Ulamaa are "the scholars of women's menses and impurities", "senile" and other such slanders. Hence, the occurrences of the Gulf War were being used in order to put in place the final steps that would allow the machinations of Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Abduh, Mohammad Suroor and others from the Kharijite Intelligentsia to be realised.

However, this great blunder, of having made open attacks against the 'Ulamaa on an issue which was down to Ijtihaad, and the subsequent attempts by the Youth of the Sahwah (The [Re]-Awakening [of Qutubism]) to force this viewpoint upon the people, and their belittlement of the Ulamaa and slandering of them, drew the refutations of the Salafi Mashayikh against this, since it – as well as other factors -, revealed to them, that there was an organised agenda behind the scenes, and that positions were being held and orientations being propounded, not due to sincere Ijtihaads but, on account of organised party-plans. And this was because the Qutubiyyah rejected the advice given to them by the Mashaayikh in what was to follow after the Gulf War, and in turn displayed and revealed what they were upon of secret organisations and hizbiyyah and party-loyalty. This revealed what has been alluded to earlier of one of the ways and means of the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, in actualizing their goals and objectives, and

that is to belittle the true and real scholars and to raise themselves as the true and real scholars.

When Saddaam was expelled from Kuwait, and the foreign forces left Saudi soil (with some remaining), what the Qutubites had claimed and propounded to the youth, and used to assault and bring down the major Ulamaa, (i.e. of the claim of military occupation) was exposed to be what it was. In light of this, the Qutubiyyah then attempted to save face. Firstly, they claimed that what they meant by “occupation” was not a military occupation as such, but an “economic, ideological occupation”. Then they began to outline some of the negative effects of the bringing of American troops. So Salman al-Awdah gave a fiery speech on Christianization of Arabs in Saudi Arabia, in which he spoke with lightning and thunderbolts. He did not conveniently mention that through the efforts and co-ordination of da’wah activities of Muhammad al-‘Akkaas, a worker at Aramco, over 2000 American troops became Muslim. Further, in the whole history of Aramco and its presence in Eastern Saudi Arabia (for 50 years or so), alongside all the Christians present, throughout the decades, there is not a single Saudi known who became Christian.

And likewise they also then claimed that “true liberation” is when the aggressive force is repelled from Kuwait and Kuwait is also returned to a true Islamic state, and that this did not occur and hence there were no real benefits in the repulsion of the Ba’thists, and no real benefits in seeking the aid of the Kuffar, rather only harms. So then they began to save face in this manner.

In a similar manner, their treatment of the affairs of Afghanistan, when they greatly praised and aggrandized the movements there (those of Innovation), and made such great exaggerations, and bewildered the youth. But when the Innovating Heretics plotted against and assassinated Shaikh Jameel ur-Rahmaan, the initiator of the Jihaad, the Activists (those of Saudi, the Qutubiyyah), then denied all expertise of the knowledge of the affairs. So then they began to advise the youth, “stick to the major ‘Ulamaa”, and “this is a fitnah” and so on. So they could not even differentiate between a Sunni Salafi and a Bid’iyy Khalafi in their walaa and baraa, and when matters overwhelmed them, they ran back into the snake burrow and denied all expertise of current affairs.

All of this displayed the great contradiction of these Qutubites, because these same Qutubites (such as Salman al-Awdah) would praise and aggrandise the so-called “Islamic State” of Sudan - of Bashir and Turabi -, that is Hasan Turabi the Apostate Zindeeq, who makes lawful what Allaah has made unlawful, and who calls the Islamic laws backwards, and calls for their re-interpretation. When the Salafi Mashaayikh observed all of this about them, their machinations, their plots and their wicked contradictions, they came to know that there was more to these Activists that met the eye.

Then later, the Qutubiyyah (Salman al-Awdah), in cahoots with the Dr. of Fitnah, Muhammad al-Mas’ari, the leader of Hizb ut-Tahrir in Saudi Arabia, set up the CDLR

(Committee for the Defence of Legal Rights). This was merely another attempt to sow the seeds of discord and to lay the groundwork for another attempt at khurooj. Some of the people of knowledge (Ibn Jibreen), being deceived by the Qutubiyyah, partook in this, but later abandoned it, at the advice of other scholars and when the major scholars (like Ibn Uthaimeen) lambasted this committee and labelled it a means of fitnah and corruption and the likes – based upon the established Sunni point of aqeedah, of having patience upon oppression and tyranny and not raising the hand of disobedience, which only causes greater harm to the people.

It was really here that the workings of Qutubi Suroori School of Doctrine through the eighties came to the forefront, during and after the fitnah of the Gulf War. Realising this, the Qutubiyyah decided to go underground once more, but it was too late. **They had come out of the closet, made serious blunders, and revealed all.** When the Salafi Mashaayikh thereafter, gathered and analysed the cassette lectures of these individuals and their writings, then they saw the true realities, and they observed that the activists were actually upon the manhaj and agenda of Qutb and Bannaa – in the most clearest of ways.

Anyhow, after the Gulf War the Salafi Mashaayikh and ‘Ulamaa then began to deconstruct what the Qutubi Suroori School of Doctrine had constructed in the years gone by and so we saw our Ulamaa subsequently refuting the writings and teachings of Sayyid Qutb, Hassan al-Bannaa. They spoke against the extremism in Takfir and Haakimiyyah and on the innovation of Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah. They spoke about the bid’ah of al-Muwaazanah (mentioning the good points of the Innovators when refuting them). They spoke of the manner of giving advice to the Rulers and the necessity of obeying them in that which is good. Indeed they spoke of many affairs that the Qutubites, Suroorites and others had deviated in and caused confusion in, especially in the matters of al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel.

The Gulf War was indeed a fitnah from many different angles. Of course, from the point of view of the great loss of life. And then also from the point of view that it was to cause turmoil to the da’wah of Ahl us-Sunnah. And also from the point of view that the Innovators - those whose da’wah is primarily based around circumstances and events, those who make the Book and the Sunnah to fit around the events and circumstances that their da’wah is based around, rather than the other way around – they were given the opportunity to take advantage of what had happened in the Gulf War to support the particular da’wah they were upon, and to use it to attack the da’wah of Ahl us-Sunnah, that of the Salaf. Hence, increased spasms were witnessed amongst the sect of Hizbut-Tahrir, likewise the outright Khawaarij, like the sect of Abdullah Faisal, that of Abu Qataadah, that of Abu Hamzah al-Misri (in the UK) and many others and similar events took place across the globe.

The ripples of the Gulf War and the precipitation of the da’wahs of Qutubism, Suroorism, Turaathism travelled rapidly over the years that followed and affected much of the youth of Ahl us-Sunnah. Subsequently, there were two parties:

- a) those who adhered to the major Scholars and the Salafi Mashaayikh who had been instrumental in refuting the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Turaathiyyah and their likes (i.e. those who had monopolised on the Gulf Crisis for their own innovatory aims), and who sought the clarifications of the Scholars, and adhered to the clear and manifest Salafi manhaj and
- b) those in whom there occurred “dakhan” (i.e. a taint, as occurs in the hadeeth of Hudhayfah Ibn alYamaan) and who had been caught up in, or confused by, or had shown partisanship to, or had been affected by something of the teachings of Qutubism, Suroorism, Turaathism and Bannaawism, or who had shown allegiance to or indifference to those upon these doctrines or who were propounding these doctrines, who who fell into great ignorance of these affairs.

The latter group had not truly understood the nature of the fitnah and where it had come from and what had been going on behind the scenes, both prior to the Gulf War and after it. They had not perceived, that at long last, the Ikhwani da'wah had finally managed to penetrate into the innermost recesses of the Salafi da'wah. Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah was but the born-again bid'ah of Sayyid Qutb and the “collective work” and the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah, (of the Turaath and al-Awdah fame) were but the born-again bid'ahs of Hassan al-Bannaa.

In the midst of all of this confusion, many (ignorant) individuals arose claiming to be the “rectifiers” and who tried to rectify matters by saying these were matters of permissible ijtihaad (i.e. the innovations in manhaj of the Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah and Turaathiyyah) and that we should flee from the fitnah and so on, without even knowing what was the actual fitnah, and without even perceiving where it actually lay and from where it had come, and who was responsible for it! These so called rectifiers and callers (in the West) – in their compound ignorance of what was going on - only confused the whole affair and in turn caused many of the youth to turn away from the Salafi Mashaayikh who were instrumental in clarifying the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah, foremost amongst them the Imaam of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel of our times, Shaikh Rabee' Ibn Haadee and also Shaikh Muqbil bin Haadee and likewise the Madinah Shaikhs, all of whom stood to defend Sunnah and Salafiyyah from what had been entered into it at the hands of the Innovating Heretics.

What created further confusion was that many of the major scholars were unaware of the Qutubi, Suroori, Bannaawi influences upon the Activists. In reality, those who were the most knowledgeable of the Activists and their deviation were the Madinan Shaikhs. When the affair became clear to Imaam al-Albaani in 1997 (1417H), he labelled the neo-Qutubiyyah, and Surooriyyah as “The Khawaarij of the Era” and he also said, “It has become apparent to me that our brothers in Madinah were more knowledgeable of them (i.e. the Surooriyyah, Qutubiyyah) than us”. But on account of the lack of clarity amongst the Scholars, about the true nature of the Qutubi da'wah and its theoreticians in Saudi Arabia, the Qutubites themselves monopolized on this, and in turn spread many shubuhaat amongst the youth, that would create more confusion and hide the great deviation that the Qutubiyyah were upon, shubuhaat

which to this day are still rampant. And the shubuhaat took the form of apparent praises or defences that were made by some of the scholars for some of the Qutubite, Suroorite Activists.

And these affairs continued up until the present times. The Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah continue today in their intellectual and devised assault against Ahl us-Sunnah – in order to achieve their agenda, **but they have taken a different and more insidiously intelligent approach** – which cannot be covered here. The Qutubites are still at it. The war is still on. But most people are ignorant of these realities – and in Allaah is the refuge. There are many people who are ignorant of these affairs – and their well-known slogan is that those who refute the Qutubiyyah are “fitnah-makers” and that there is no such thing as the “Qutubiyyah”!! By Allaah, what blindness, deafness and dumbness. As one of the Salaf said, “The Aalim sees the fitnah before it comes, and the Jaahil sees its tail end”. It is feared that the likes of these people, in their compound ignorance, won’t even see its tail end, before it disappears, if Allaah wills.

It must also be pointed out here, that the basis of the objection of Ahl us-Sunnah, the Atharis, the Salafis, against all Activist Orientations (comprising takfir, jihad and haakimiyyah) is not an objection based upon the end goal and objective, but based upon method and style, that is the method and style that is used by the Innovators in revival and reformation. Unfortunately, many of the diseased partisans like to portray that Ahl us-Sunnah who refute the Qutubites, Suroorites, neo-Kharijites, the Takfiris, the Jihadis (of the Sayyid Qutb brand of Jihaad) and who call to the Prophetic Manhaj and adhere to it, and do not deviate from it, have an objective of supporting the Infidels and their plans, and of supporting the “New World Order” (a discussion of which will follow later) or that they are “enemy in truth” or that they “deny Jihad”!! and other such great lies and slanders.

Before closing it is vitally important to make note of a few matters. And whoever understands this will understand a great deal of other matters, if Allaah wills.

Firstly, there is no doubt that there is a concerted effort by the Infidels and the Descendants of Apes and Pigs to “divide and conquer” the Muslim lands. We do not need the “New World Order” fanatics to tell us that. Neither do we need the groups and movements of Innovation to tell us that. We have already been informed of this by Allaah and His Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), in that the (disbelieving) nations will invite each other to take from the Muslim (lands), just like a group of people gather together to eat from a plate, despite the greatness of the number of Muslims at that time, a time in which the Muslims will have the love of life and fear of death in their hearts.

Further, whoever contemplates upon the history of this Ummah, from the lifetime of Allaah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) to this day of ours, will realise that there were always the major forces of the Kuffar of the time who were attempting either economic, geo-political, religious (or doctrinal) domination. This is nothing

knew, and is manifestly clear. But none of the Scholars of that time, ever kicked up a frenzy about a “New World Order”, rather they saw things from a Qur’an and Sunnah perspective, and treated matters accordingly.

Secondly, this domination (of the Kuffar), is only allowed to happen, when the Ummah displays and manifests that which justifies the command of Allaah (of humiliation and defeat) to be effected – which is departure from Tawheed and the Sunnah and Taqwaa and Righteous Deeds and so on.

Thirdly, in light of the above, inviting the common Muslims to face up to the “New World Order” and to become “activist” and to engage in “the political process”- and to be poisoned by the extremist methodologies of Takfir and Haakimiyyah, of Qutb, Bannaa and Mawdudi in the lands of the Muslims- and other such affairs, are not the way to treat and repel the “New World Order”. Rather, these orientations have only led to further humiliation and destruction – and in reality, these methodologies, which are opposed to the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, are the very methodologies that assist and support the “New World Order” – in the destabilisation of governments and nation states, and internal turmoil, paving the way for the increased intervention of Infidelic forces, and subsequent subjugation and control – that I am sure any Muslim would not welcome.

This is exactly what the Kuffar want. Where are the fruits of Qutubism and Bannaawism? Is there a khilaafah in Syria? Is there a khilaafah in Egypt? Is there a khilaafah in Algeria? Do not the biased partisans know that when the ‘Ulamaa at the time of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah called the people to invoke Allaah alone, when seeking aid against the Tartars, instead of those in the graves, and when Tawheed was generally actualised amongst the masses - that Allaah gave the Muslims such a mighty victory, not attained previously? And this was exactly what our ‘Ulamaa advised to the Algerian people – to invite to Tawheed and to purify themselves and leave off the hasty taking of arms and the likes, and to have patience upon whatever calamities befell them, till Allaah provides a way out.

Fourthly, and it is in light of the above, that we re-iterate once again that the way of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah, the Salafis, is that they treat all events and occurrences in light of the dictates of the Book and the Sunnah and the Prophetic Methodology, the Manhaj of the Salaf, and hence, regardless of whatever calamities occur (i.e. the Tartars, the Crusades, the Gulf War etc.), their Manhaj and their perceptions do not change. As opposed to the Innovating Heretics amongst the diseased and hasty partisans who lead the Ummah to destruction on innovated, heretical doctrines and methodologies and who disfigure the Salafi Manhaj and who change it and innovate into it and exaggerate into it, in order to treat the affairs. So they make the Book and the Sunnah and the Manhaj of the Salaf to fit around the particular event(s) or occurrence(s) that are the motivating factors for their da’wah. This is Qutubism. This is Bannaawism. This is Turaathism. This is Suroorism. This is the way of the Azzaami Firqah, those who monopolise on the defensive Jihaads in the various lands, providing coverage of them (as if they themselves are physically present), and then whipping up

sentiments, emotions and frenzies, in people who are generally ignorant of the Salafi manhaj, and then use all of this to invite people to the manhaj of the Khawaarij and to Irjaa' towards the Innovators, which is actually what they are upon.

All of these people (following their mentors and figureheads) innovated into the religion, such orientations and methodologies that are alien to it, and in the name and argument of fighting against the “New World Order” and “the apostate rulers” they enticed many from Ahl us-Sunnah and corrupted their minds and intellects, and took them away from the Straight Path of Allaah, that of the Prophets, the Caliphs, the Inheritors of the Prophets, the Salaf, and the Rabbaani Scholars of our times, and led them instead to the Heretical Innovators, like Qutb and Bannaa, and Qaradawi, and Suroor and their likes and their deviant methodologies, thinking themselves to be rightly guided in all of that. And then they claimed that anyone who did not agree to their particular innovated methodologies and did not work in their particular circles, were “supporters of the New World Order” and “spreaders of cancerous teachings” and “deniers of Jihaad” and other such lies and slanders.

In short, this was the Sunni, Salafi perspective on the Gulf War, the perspective of those whose manhaj never changed neither before nor after the Gulf War – and this was because, to them all events and occurrences are made to fit around the dictates of the Book and the Sunnah and the Manhaj of the Salaf – and hence their manhaj never changed. Whereas to the Innovators, the Manhaj of the Salaf is twisted and made to fit around the various events or circumstances that are instrumental to them in their apologeticism and argument for their particular da'wah and in their bid to invite and entice people to their da'wah. This is why many of them turned from loving Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee prior to the Gulf War, to actually hating his guts after the Gulf War. And this is why many of them held the Saudi Mashaayikh in high esteem, amongst them Imaam Ibn Baaz and Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen before the Gulf War, and then after the Gulf War they began to raise the likes of the hardcore Qutubites, like Safar al-Hawali and Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaaliq, the hardened Shurocrat and Bannaawi, above and over the major Ulamaa, and claim that the major Ulamaa are “not all there”, or at least that is what the tongue of their disposition necessitated – despite the fact that it was as clear as the daylight sun, that those who deviated, had deviated because they had been poisoned from the direction of the Bankrupt Brotherhood, and the teachings of Qutb and Bannaa.

Finally it is important to make note of one more matter. And this is that during the early 1990s, when this fitnah had not really affected the people in the West, and things seemed to be alright, on the surface at least, many da'ees (callers) gained popularity on account of their da'wah work, which at that time, seemed to be in accordance with the Salafi Manhaj in its details. This was at a time, when generally speaking the Salafi manhaj was not clear – mainly because the partisan organisations at the time and also individuals known for da'wah work, who had strength in the da'wah, were not really connecting the youth to the true and real major scholars, or at least maintaining that link. In reality, connections with the scholars in the early 90s were only for the purposes of boosting hizbiyyah to the organisation itself (such as the farce of JIMAS in

the early 90s). In what was to follow, when the fitnah (following the Gulf War and following the precipitation of the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Turaathiyyah and others) reached the West, a great deal of confusion emerged.

This confusion only really began to be removed around 1996, when some of the scholars (such as Shaikh al-Anjaree, Shaikh Abu Anas Hamad al-Uthmaan, Shaikh Muhammad bin Haadee and others) came and brought out the issues openly and clarified the da'wah. From that point onwards, over the years, more and more clarity emerged as the Salafis forged tighter links to the Ulamaa as a whole, those of Saudi (Makkah, Madinah), Kuwait, Yemen, Jordan, Bahrain and others. During this "purification" period, the true realities of many of the callers (da'ees) who had gained popularity prior to this time became apparent, and their ignorance of the manhaj also showed, despite it having been sufficiently clarified, and their aversion to the scholars who had clarified these issues (like Shaikh Rabee', the Madinan Shaikhs in general, Shaikh Muqbil and others) also came to the forefront. In light of this ever-emerging clarity, Ahl us-Sunnah managed to identify and adhere to this clarity and to the people of clarity, and at the same time identify those in whom there was a "taint" (i.e. dakhn, as occurs in the hadeeth of Hudhaifah), from amongst the da'ees who had become popular. And the situation continues like this walhamdulillah, in that on account of the blessing of the connection with the Scholars, and especially the Imaams of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel, like Shaikh Rabee' and Shaikh Muqbil, who were the most instrumental in refuting and exposing the innovatory orientations of our time, Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, the Atharis, continue to be upon further clarity and insight as to the Straight Path of Allaah, while the Innovators, People of Desires, Biased Partisans (Hizbees) and Confused Partisans, the "Tribulators" (those who cause fitnah) and the Seekers of Fame and Glory and all those who show allegiance and loyalty to them, continue to fall, one by one.

Al-Barbahaaree said, "To set up trials in Islaam is an Innovation. **As for today, people should be tested for the Sunnah**, because of his saying, "This is the knowledge of the religion, so look from whom you take your religion..." (Sharh us-Sunnah, no. 152, and the latter part of the narration is that of Muhammad bin Seereen, the Taabi'ee).



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 12

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 16. Can you tell us more some more realities of the Gulf War and the effects of da'wah of the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, thereafter?

The first thing to note, as has been alluded to earlier is that the great contradiction of the Qutubites was brought to the forefront. They condemned the seeking of assistance of the Kuffaar in Saudi Arabia for repelling the Ba'thi Apostate, Saddaam Hussain, and claimed it was unlawful, in absolute terms, and that it only brings about harm and no benefit. But they declared it obligatory for the Muslims to unite with the Communists and Socialists in Yemen (Salman al-Awdah) and that the whole country, in reality is Islamic, and judges to the Sharee'ah in all affairs. And then they declared it obligatory to seek the assistance of the Rafidite Shites and Communists in conquering Kabul. And they declared the assistance of the Kuffar to be permissible for the Bosnian people. And they declared the assistance of the United Nations to be permissible for the Kurds in Northern Iraaq. And this showed the Mashaayikh that these people actually have an agenda and are toying with [or being toyed by] Machiavellian Machinations, and that they do not have consistent knowledge based positions.

Other contradictions included their enjoining of mentioning the good points of the Innovators (like Qutb, Bannaa and others) in order maintain justice, but then in their wicked assault and attacks against the Salafi Mashayikh who exposed them, and who were upon a sound Salafi aqeedah and manhaj (unlike Qutb and Bannaa, their true mentors and leaders), they failed to live up to their own principles, and failed to mention, along with their slanders and lies, the many virtues and excellencies of these Mashaayikh!

And there are other affairs, too numerous to mention (and whoever desires more, let him refer to the book “al-Qutubiyyah”), but in short, all of this indicated that the Qutubiyyah had a Machiavellian Manhaj, which was crooked, distorted, bent, and which was built upon lies and deceit.

The second of these effects was that the outright pure Khawaarij in all corners of the globe became affiliated with the likes of Safar and Salman. This was not surprising because the books and reference points of all neo-Kharijites are the books of Sayyid Qutb and Mawdudi, and the Qutubiyyah in Arabia, were actually preaching the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb, having been poisoned by them in the eighties, under the supervision of Sayyid Qutb’s brother, Mohammad Qutb.

Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, when asked about the saying that Salman al-Awdah is the “Imaam of Qutubiyyah” said, “I personally do not say this, however he is not far from it. Do you not see how all of the Takfeeris and Khawaarij in all of the various parts of the world, without exception, consider him to be their Imaam? And opposite to this, they attack the Mashaayikh such as Ibn Baaz, al-Albaani and Ibn Uthaimeen? By Allaah, my daughter, this country would not even have known Sayyid Qutb and his innovations, and nor would the youth have had any knowledge of him and become attached to him and start to show love for Ahl ul-Bid’ah had it not been for the writings of Shaikh Salmaan may Allaah guide him, and his making Sayyid an Imaam. Shaikh Salmaan hears and sees, just like you do from those Takfeeris, outside of this country, and he knows that they consider him to be an Imaam, so why does he and Shaikh Safar, why do they not publicly announce in every single place that they are free of them (the Takfeeris) and from their ideas in their own books, cassettes, magazines and newspapers and on the Internet? So that our youth and our sons and our lands can be freed from their tribulation? We are still waiting from these two Shaikhs to recant from their previous errors, for which we have not heard any recantation. And we also await for them to free themselves from Ahl ul-Bid’ah, those who in every place, especially the Takfeeris...” (3rd July 2000, phone conversation with a Sister from the Emirates).

And reflect upon the saying of Yahyaa bin Sa’eed al-Qattaan who said, “When Sufyaan ath-Thawree came to Basrah he began to look into the affair of ar-Rabee’ bin Subaih and the people’s estimation of him. He asked them, ‘What is his madhhab?’ so they said, ‘His madhhab is but the Sunnah’. He then asked, ‘Who is his companionship?’ and they replied, ‘The people of Qadr’ so he replied, ‘In that case he is a Qadari’.” (Al-Ibaanah 2/453) – for the madhhab of the followers and associates gives evidence to the madhhab of the one being followed!

The third matter is that after the Gulf War many organisations sprung up which in the name of “social justice” (one of the slogans of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi, the Father of the Khawaarij) and “defence of human rights” began to prepare encyclopedias of the sins, iniquities, disobedience and faults of the rulers and those in authority in Saudi Arabia. Such organisations included MIRA, and CDLR (set up by al-Mis’ari, the Tahriri) and others. The activities of these groups, who were actually

operating from the lands of the Infidels created a more intense environment in which hatred and animosity (towards the scholars and rulers) increased and permeated into the society. Of course, we hate sin and disobedience and make disownment from the likes of these sins and hate their occurrence, regardless of whom they occur from, whether the ruler or ruled. And we also make our loyalty and disownment based upon Tawheed, Sunnah and Taqwaa, whether it is for the ruler or the one ruled over. But this does not necessitate that a person wail and shout, and scream and cry about the “corruption” and “tyranny” and so on, since there are avenues and ways – based upon the Share’eeah – in which reformation and correction is to be achieved, bearing in mind the welfare of the servants of Allaah, in all of that. This is the way of Ahl us-Sunnah and their Rabbaani Scholars, as opposed to the Rowdy Hooligans, who merely let off steam, rant, rave and shout and do not really achieve anything but the kindling of further tribulation that only falls back upon the innocent civilian Muslims and not those whom they are attempting to remove or replace.

And the activities of these organisations are actually outside of the teachings of the Sunnah, and were in fact, representative of the machinations of the Kharijite Renegades. And we do not believe that this is the route to “reformation” and “rectification” in the land, rather it only leads to further tribulations. What will they achieve? Rouse the sentiments of the common-folk so that they get up for a bloody revolution and confrontation with the authorities?! In order to remove them?! In order to correct them?! This is what these cowards are attempting to achieve. They fled on their heels, with the greatest of cowardice, and sought political asylum with the Infidels, sit and live comfortably in the lands of the Kuffaar, and then plan and plot the precursors to revolutions in the land of the Muslims! And where does the long-term benefit lie in the likes of these activities. Is it in the Muslim lands? Is it for the common Muslims themselves? Or to the Kuffaar who thrive on the instability of nation states, or who in fact promote the likes of these affairs, while they sharpen their fangs and claws, ready for their own intervention?

The fourth matter is that the effects of these destructive methodologies and the books of bid’ah and dalaalah soon became apparent, when some Saudis organised terrorist activity and arranged for bomb attacks in places like Khobar and Ulayyaa, disturbing the security and sanctity of the land. All of the major scholars, unanimously, condemned these attacks, and declared them to be from the way of the [Kharijite] Renegades (and whoever wishes to see the various fataawaa in this regard should refer to Kaifa Nu’aaliju Waaqi’unaa al-Aleem). The 4 Saudi youth behind the bombing in Ulayyaa admitted that they were the students of the Kharijite Renegade, Issaam Barqaawi Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi, who performed takfir of the Saudi State in its entirety and also declared the Scholars to be Apostate, referring to them as the “Scholars of Iblees” and to Ibn Baaz as “the leader of the convoy”. The da’wah of the Qutubiyyah in general was to pave way for the likes of these activities and these types of destructive sentiments in the minds of people, which in the long term only serve to bring destruction upon the common-folk by civil unrest, strife, and the removal of safety and security in the land, and which in reality, do not assist in removing any rulers or replacing them. The general frameset of these individuals was brought about

by the sophistry of the likes of Safar al-Hawali and others, who during the Gulf War had preached to the youth that a “military occupation” of Saudi Arabia had occurred – whipping up frenzies and sentiments. And also by the activities of Salman al-Awdah, who argued in favour of open rejection against the Rulers – opposing thereby one of the Usool of the aqeedah and manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah – who had argued that since the Father of the Khawaarij(!) had openly made rejection against Allaah’s Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and accused him of not being just, and since he was not imprisoned or rebuked immediately, it is therefore lawful for us to openly make rejection. By Allaah, what a despicable state do the books of bid’ah and dalaalah lead a person to!

Add to that their takfir on account of major sins, like singing, fornication and drinking, and their portraying to the youth that many have fallen into kufr by making these affairs lawful merely because they performed these sins in an organised, calculated, persistent manner(!) – so they preached to the youth that kufr has spread in the land!! So the activities and doctrines of the Qutubiyyah led to a destructive frameset in the minds of the youth, and this destructiveness would later show in the terrorist activities that were to take place. And these activities do not rectify nor change anything!! As Algeria and Syria and Egypt will testify!! They only lead to civil unrest **in which the civilians suffer the most** – and no goodness even comes out of it! Which is why the neo-Qutubiyyah were prevented and imprisoned, with their books and cassettes being banned, because of the tumult that would emerge on account of the Qutubism they were brainwashing the youth with.

The fifth matter is that there was an increased level of Takfir without adhering to the principles of Takfir – in other words, absolute unrestricted Takfir, without going through the Sharee’ah guidelines of actually coming to a judgement of takfir upon a specific individual (or groups of individuals, or societies or nation states). The reason why this increased amongst Activist and Takfiri circles because of what had occurred in the mind of people **of the clustering of concepts** which together created a “Takfiri” mental state, which when stimulated would result in hasty Takfir without tafseel and takfir in an unrestricted manner. What had led to the clustering of such concepts that subsequently led to this disorder of extremism in Takfir were the activities of the neo-Kharijite Qutubiyyah, and their analyses and statements and generally extremist, exaggerated, sentimentalist manhaj.

So for example, they portrayed that Saudi Arabia had been “militarily occupied” by Kuffaar forces (whereas the Kuffaar were merely employed to assist in defending the land from a Ba’thi Apostate and his army) and that “ribaah had been made lawful in the country, by millions of Muslims” and that “kufr is rampant in the newspapers”, and that any claim to judging by the Sharee’ah was “an ancient claim” and that every single country on the face of this earth was raising the flag of Secularism, and add to all of this the preaching of the absolutism of Sayyid Qutb – in which whole nation states are declared apostate, by the mere presence of secular laws in the land – and add to that the generally emotional and whimsical nurturing that the Qutubite Theoreticians gave to the youth concerning the Gulf War and other events, upon other than sound

Sharee'ah knowledge, and also the conspiracy theories they presented – then it lead to a severe Takfiri Mental Disorder, in which the judgement of takfir would be initiated by only the weakest of stimuli. A symptom of this mental disorder was that major sins would be treated as kufr and apostasy. So the taking of ribaa' – even if an organised and calculated manner – would receive the judgement of takfir and apostasy. Or the persistent or organised commission of major sins, or oppression, would first be labelled “corruption”, then over a matter of time it would become “an act of kufr” and then outright “apostasy” with specious forms of deductive logic and Qutubi paradigms. Yet others (from those affected by Qutubism), when asked as to whether they considered so and so person or ruler a kaafir and whether they make takfir or not, their reply would be “I do not say he is a Muslim and nor a Kaafir”, and in reality this is hidden and implicit takfir, since the basis is that a person's Islaam is affirmed with certainty and is not removed except with certainty. So there emerged a new breed of Takfiri Dissidents who hinted and implied takfir in the greatest of ways but without verbally stating this judgement of takfir. And all of this resulted from the entrance of the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb upon the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah.

The sixth matter was that whereas before only the Soofees, the Mutasawwifah, the Naqshabandites, the Bareilwites, the Muqallid Hanafites and others would accuse everyone who did not agree with their innovations and who adhered to Tawheed and Ittibaa' to be a “Wahhaabi” and affiliated to Saudi Arabia, and hence deserving of rebuke and blame. Following the Gulf War and following the activities of the neo-Qutubiyyah and the intellectual efforts of the neo-Bannaawiyyah (like Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayjee), a new wave of accusations were born. Hence, anyone who spoke well of the Saudi state and its sound aqeedah, and the proliferation of Tawheed and the Sunnah within the country in general, the abundance of good scholars, and the much good that exists, and who adhered to the Salafi Manhaj and rejected the Qutubi Manhaj, were then labelled “Saudi Salafis” and “Neo-Salafis”. Terms that are similar in import to the word “Wahhabi” that was used by other Innovators in previous times. And hence a polarisation occurred in that those who became affected by the da'wah of the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Turaathiyyah, [Khaarijiyyah 'Asriyyah], accused those who did not agree with their adulterated manhaj with terms like “Neo-Salafis” and “Saudi Salafis”. Thus a new series of terms were unleashed to further assault Ahl us-Sunnah. Meaning that these terms conjure up similar images that these neo-Salafis are “stooges” and “paid” and that “their da'wah is backed by the Saudi State” and only “serves the interests of the Saudi State” and that they make tabdee' of the Muslims and takfir of the Islamic Jamaa'aat and other such claims and fanciful lies, all of which augmented the assault that Ahl us-Sunnah were already receiving from the rest of Ahl ul-Bid'ah.

The seventh matter is that though the Qutubiyyah came out of the closet during the Gulf War, made blunders, exposed what they were really upon, and were subsequently exposed and refuted, they then retreated to the snake burrow, in order to re-assess the Qutubite Stratagem for the coming years. The most important element of this new strategy would actually be on the intellectual front, co-ordinated and supervised by Mohammad Qutb, the brother of Sayyid Qutb. And this would take the form of the re-

expression of Mohammad Qutb's decade old accusations of Irjaa' – in the doctorate thesis “Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'” which was a distillation of the thought of Sayyid Qutb, reconstructed with cleverly thought out intellectual constructs, and presented as if it were the pure doctrine of Ahl us-Sunnah. This would help to lay the foundations for the accusation of Irjaa' against the Imaams of the Sunnah, Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz and Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen, and thus render their viewpoints on the affairs of Haakimiyyah, Rule, Rulership and ruling by what Allaah has revealed to be erroneous and representative of the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan, and in turn render the viewpoints of the Rafidee Heretic who took the honour of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam) and Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), to be Sunnah and Salafiyyah embodied. This move was in reality a hidden, calculated, devised attempt to try once more, to bring the extremist heretical manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, into the inner recesses of Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, the Atharis. Indeed the book became a laughing stock, when it became apparent that in attempting to accuse the vast majority of Ahlus-Sunnah with blameworthy Irjaa' on the theoretical front – the author of the book fell into it himself on the practical front by not making the istithnaa' (exception) when labelling Sayyid Qutb a “Shaheed” (and as is narrated from the Salaf, the asl, basis, of Irjaa' is to not make the exception), and also his treating the Imaan of an Innovating, Sinning Rafidee Heretic, who uttered kufr and apostasy, to be equivalent to the Imaan of the greatest of the Shaikhs ul-Islaam, such as Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abdul-Wahhaab – and also his expression of elements of the Jahmite negation of there being any link between the internal and the external in the acts of Kufr, just like there was a link between them both in acts of Imaan. But this is the result of toying with innovation, in that the perpetrator, eventually, gets toyed by the innovation itself – and refuge is from Allaah.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 13

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 17. There are some doubts that the Qutubiyyah and those affected by this manhaj use in order to justify khurooj (rebellion).

Yes. Amongst the greatest of characteristics that single out the Qutubiyyah, the Kharijites, and those affected or poisoned by their doctrines is their calls for rebellions and violence as the only way for the establishment of the Islamic authority. And they use numerous doubts to this end, and which shall be answered by the people of knowledge in what follows below:

Doubt 1: Khurooj is required without needing to look at the state of weakness

This was answered by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen who said: "And there is a doubt (shubhah) with many of the youth, which has become firmly and deeply rooted in their minds and it has kindled the issue of revolting against the rulers - and it is: that those rulers replace the Sharee'ah (haa'ulaa il-Hukkaam mubaddiloon), they prescribe the (secular) laws from themselves and they do not rule by what Allaah has revealed and the rule is present - but they prescribed laws from themselves. So (these youth) judged them with apostasy and disbelief and then they built upon this that so long as those rulers are disbeliever it is necessary to kill them, and does not matter that we are in a state of weakness. Because (not fighting) in the state of weakness was abrogated by the verses of the sword (permitting fighting), therefore there is no place for acting (as if we were) in the state of weakness - as they say - that state that the Muslims in Makkah were in!

So the answer to this doubt is that we say: "There is no escaping from that we know firstly: Does the description of apostasy apply to them or not? And this requires knowing the evidences which indicate that this saying or action is apostasy, then applying them to an individual, and then, whether this individual has any doubts (which may excuse him) or

not? Meaning: Sometimes a text can indicate that this action is kufr and this saying is kufr, but there are preventive barriers which prevent the application of the ruling of kufr upon this specific individual.

And these preventive barriers are many, amongst them dhann (speculation) which is ignorance and amongst them ghalabah (which means being overcome by something).

So the man who said to his family, “When I die burn me and scatter my ashes in the sea because if Allaah grasps me He will punish me with a punishment that He has never inflicted upon anyone in the world”. The apparent belief of this man is kufr and doubt in the power of Allaah. However, when Allaah brought him together [to his original form] and addressed Him, his reply was, “O my Lord, I feared You!” Or a wording similar to it. So he forgave him, and therefore, this act arose from this person unintentionally.

Similar to him is the person who was overcome by joy and took hold of his camel [which he had lost] and said, “O Allaah, You are my servant and I am your Lord”, a statement of kufr. However, this person did not become a disbeliever on account of it, because he was overwhelmed and was overcome (by something he could not repel). On account of the severity of his joy he erred. He actually intended to say, “O Allaah, You are my Lord and I am Your servant”, but he said, “O Allaah, You are my servant and I am your Lord”.

The one who is compelled is compelled to kufr, so he says a statement of kufr or does an act of kufr, but he does not become a disbeliever from any textual [evidence] from the Qur’aan because he did not intend this act and did not choose it.

So we know that these rulers judge by what the Qur’aan gives evidence to – on the basis of the various differences within the madhhabs – in the personal matters such as nikah (marriage), faraa’id (inheritance) and what is similar to them. As for judging between people, then they differ. They also have a misconception which is put in front of them by some of the evil scholars who say, “The Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) says, ‘You are more knowledgeable of the affairs of your worldly life’ ”, and that this is a general statement such that everything that brings about benefit in the worldly life then we have the freedom to choose and adopt it, because the Messenger said, “You are more knowledgeable of the affairs of your worldly life”!!

There is no doubt that this is a misconception. However does this allow them to avoid the laws of Islaam in applying the hudood (prescribed punishments) or preventing the consumption of intoxicants and what is similar to these things? It would have been more incumbent for them to have a misconception regarding some economical aspects [of rule], but as for this [matter] then there is no misconception regarding it at all.

As for completing [the discussion of] this doubt that has been cast down [concerning rebelling against the ruler], then it can be said regarding it: Allaah, after having made fighting obligatory, said: “O Prophet (Muhammad)! Urge the believers to fight. If there are twenty steadfast persons amongst you, they will overcome two hundred, and if there be a hundred steadfast persons they will overcome a thousand of those who disbelieve, because they (the

disbelievers) are people who do not understand.” (Anfaal 8:65). So how many are they?! One to ten. Then He said:

“Now Allâh has lightened your (task), for He knows that there is weakness in you. So if there are of you a hundred steadfast persons, they shall overcome two hundred, and if there are a thousand of you, they shall overcome two thousand with the Leave of Allâh. And Allâh is with As-Sâbirin (the patient ones, etc.).” (Anfaal 8:66)

And some of the scholars have said: “That was in the time of weakness, **and the ruling always revolves around its cause and basis**, therefore after Allaah made it incumbent upon them to have the patience of ten men... Further to this, we say: We have certain clear and decisive texts which explain this matter and which make it abundantly clear. Amongst them is His, the Most High’s saying: “Allâh burdens not a person beyond his scope.” (Baqarah 2:286)

So Allaah, free is He from all imperfections, does not burden a soul with more than it can bear and what it has power over. Allaah, free is He from all imperfections, also says: “So keep your duty to Allâh and fear Him as much as you are able.” (Taghaabun 64:16)

So if we declared that the aforementioned rebellion against this ruler was obligatory, **then [despite this] it would not be obligatory upon us while we are not able to remove him**. Therefore the matter is clear, but it is desire (hawaa) that makes a person relapse and stumble.” (From Fitnah of Takfir, originally from the cassette “Commentary upon Fitnah of Takfir” by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen; also in Kaifa Nu’aaliju Waaqi’unaa al-Aleem, of Abu Lawz).

And indeed, after the affairs are made clear by the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah, it is only hawaa (desire) that makes the Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah and those poisoned by their way of thinking, stumble and wander in every direction!

Doubt 2: Seeking as evidence the various rebellions that took place in history

Imaam al-Albaani was asked about the following doubt: “Some people used as evidence what occurred in Islamic history, such as the occurrence (of rebellion and fighting) in the fitnah of Ibn al-Ash’at (one of the Kharijites), and also the rebellion of many of the Reciters (of the Qur’aan), at the head of them, Sa’eed Ibn Jubair and whoever was with him. And likewise what happened from Aa’ishah (radiallaahu anhaa) and Zubair and Talhah, between them and Alee (radiallaahu anhu). So they say all of this happened and all of this was counted as rebellion and although they did not attain their actual objective, this rebellion is actually from those things that are permissible.

So is this argument by way of those occurrences which happened in the first times correct? And what is the answer? This matter is the cause of inciting many for the purpose of justifying the matter of khurooj (rebellion)”.

And Imaam al-Albaani replied, “Khurooj (rebellion) is not allowed. And these evidences that they have used are actually against the one who uses them. There is a wisdom that is

narrated from Isaa (alaihis-salaam), and its authenticity does not concern us as much as the correctness of its meaning. So it is related that he admonished his Disciples one day and informed them that there would be a Prophet who would be the Seal of the Prophets, and that there will be many false prophets after him. So they said to him “How shall we distinguish between the truthful from the liar?” And he replied by speaking with this wisdom alluded to earlier, which is his saying “By their fruits you shall know them”.

So this khurooj and that khurooj (i.e. from those previously mentioned), and amongst them is the khurooj of Aa'ishah (radiallaahu anhu), we judge this khurooj by its fruits. So were the fruits of the khurooj sweet or bitter? There is not doubt that Islamic history which has informed us about this or that khurooj makes it clear that it was evil. For the blood of the Muslims was shed, and went to waste, without any benefit being attained. Especially in what relates to the khurooj of Sayyidah Aa'ishah (radiallaahu anhaa), for she was remorseful for having made khurooj, and she used to cry severely such that her khimaar would become soaking, and would wish that she had no embarked upon that khurooj.

Hence, seeking evidence by way of these rebellions: Firstly: It is a proof against them, because there was no benefit in these rebellions

Secondly: Why do we stick to the khurooj of Sa'eed bin Jubair, but we do not stick to the absence of khurooj of the most major and senior of the Companions who were contemporary to him, such as Ibn 'Umar and others. Then the Scholars of the Salaf followed after him, and all of them saw the absence of khurooj against the ruler.

Hence, there are two types of rebellion: a) a rebellion in thought and ideology (al-khurooj al-fikri) and this is the most dangerous and b) a physical khurooj, which actually results from the first one (i.e. the ideological one).

Hence, this type of khurooj is not permissible, and the evidences you have used are actually against them, not for them.” (Cassette: “When is Khurooj Against the Ruler Allowed?”; and also in pp.94-95 of Kaifa Nu'aaliju Waaqi'unaa al-Aleem, of Abu Lawz).

Doubt 3: The Khurooj of Hussain bin Alee (radiallaahu anhu).

Shaikh Ibn Jibreen was asked, “It is said in the aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah: “And we do not rebel against a ruler”. So how do you explain these words in light of Hussain bin Alee's (radiallaahu anhu) act of rebelling against one of the Amawi Khaleefahs?”

The Shaikh replied, “Firstly: that Hussain (radiallaahu anhu) erred in this rebellion of his, and subsequently there occurred what occurred of his killing and the killing of those with him.

Secondly: He had not given the pledge of allegiance to the Khaleefah, who was Yazeed bin Mu'aawiyah. And it is well-known that Yazeed was shameless, and he was disobedient, and would drinking khamr (intoxicants, alcohol). He would also do actions, which led to

Hussain and Ibn az-Zubair and many of those from Makkah, to not give him the pledge of allegiance.

Thirdly: That the people of 'Iraaq who had written to Hussain requesting his arrival there so that they can give the pledge of allegiance to him as a Khaleefah, they too had not given the pledge of allegiance to Yazeed. So they claimed that they would give the pledge of allegiance to Hussain, so that he can be the Khaleefah, and that when he resides with them, they will support and strengthen him. However, they did not fulfil all of this for when the army that was responsible for his death, actually assaulted him, they abandoned him.” (Majmoo Fataawaa wa Rasaa'il Ibn Jibreen. Section on Aqeedah. Vol. 8; and quoted in Kaifa Nu'aaliyu Waaqi'unaa al-Aleem, of Abu Lawz, p.96).

So it is clear that the Qutubiyyah, Kharijites and Diseased Partisans – despite the clear texts from Allaah's Messenger forbidding rebellion, unless clear kufr is observed, and despite the vast majority of the Companions, the Taab'ieen and all of the Salaf after them abandoning this khurooj (rebellion), they continue to use shubuhaat in order to lead the people to the destruction of their worldly affairs, and continue to use the practice of a few – which is opposed by the majority – in order to argue for its permissibility

Imaam Ash-Shaatibee said, in reference to those matters that are only acted upon by a few companions but not by the majority: “So those others (who opposed and did not act upon it) - then (their action) is the followed Sunnah and the much-frequented path, and as for that which was not acted upon save a little, then it is obligatory to verify (its correctness) and the correctness of conforming to it - whilst persisting and remaining upon what is more well-known (i.e. not to act upon it - as the majority of the Companions did not do so). For verily, the persistence of the majority (of the Companions) in opposing the few - either it is due to a Sharee'ah reason or other than Sharee'ah reason. And it is false for it to be other than a Shar'eeah reason - in fact it is not possible but for it to be a Sharee'ah reason. And when the affair is like this then [the one] acting so as to conform to the minority is like an adversary or opposer to that understanding for which the majority investigated the action - to check that it agrees [with such an understanding]. So it is necessary to investigate what they investigated and to agree with what they persisted upon” (Muwaafaqaat 3/57)

And indeed, upon investigating the Sunnah and sayings of the Companions and the books of aqeedah of the Salaf, we find consensus that khurooj against the tyrannical ruler (rebellion) is forbidden. And as for when there is clear kufr observed, then that is subject to the resultant harms and benefits, and does not warrant automatic khurooj. Further, almost every single khurooj in the whole of Islamic history, did not actually achieve what it was supposed to achieve, which is why the Salaf showed severe rejection and aversion from khurooj and contending with the authorities, and this is also alluded by both Ibn al-Qayyim and also Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan bin Hasan Aal Shaikh in what has been quoted from them previously in this series.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 14

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 18: Concerning ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, what are the various viewpoints on this issue and how are we to understand the confusion in this regard?

This is a lengthy answer and requires detailed treatment of each of the associated issues. Nevertheless, an attempt will be made to summarise everything so that a sufficient overview can be provided.

ONE: The issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed encompasses all individuals, the ruler and the ruled, the husband and the wife, the judge and the judged and so on. Confining this affair to the rulers alone is one of the innovations of the Khawarij of our times, and this why you see the clear manifestation that these Innovators will show allegiance and loyalty to those who judge by what Allaah has revealed pertaining to rulership and the social affairs, but not in other affairs (Tawheed, Ibaadah, Ittibaa) and showing disownment and making takfir of those who judge by what Allaah has revealed in the affairs of Tawheed, Ibaadah, 'Ittibaa' and the likes, but who do not judge by all of what Allaah has revealed in the affairs of rulership and social dealings. And indeed, this in itself is sufficient to expose the scandal of the Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah.

TWO: All of the actions that have been labelled as kufr in the texts of the Book and the Sunnah, fall into the following categories.

- a) Those that are unequivocally major kufr that expels from the religion (such as kicking the Qur'aan, cursing the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and other such affairs), and which after the conditions have been met and barriers removed, the judgement of takfir is pronounced. It is not required for these acts that they be

accompanied with istihlaal or juhood or associated beliefs in order to pass the judgement of takfir. Rather, it is merely sufficient that the conditions for takfir are met and the barriers removed. These acts are such that they cannot occur on the limbs, except with the passing away of Imaan in its totality. Hence, they are considered to represent kufr both internally and externally.

- b) Those that are unequivocally the minor kufr that does not expel from the religion (such as the major sins, like drinking, fornicating, taking usury and so on). These acts do not warrant the judgement of takfir, unless they are clearly accompanied with istihlaal (making them lawful, as a matter of belief), juhood (wilful rejection of them), takdheeb (denial, rejection) and the likes. If these associated conditions are found, then following the guidelines of takfir of an individual, takfir is made. In the absence of these conditions, then these acts remain as sins and disobedience, with some of them being more severe than others.
- c) Those that are differed upon and which in the view of some fall into the first type (i.e. those that are major kufr) and in the view of others fall into the second type (i.e. those that are minor kufr).

Having understood this, we now need to look at the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, its various types and manifestations, and the ruling upon each one of them, and the views of the scholars concerning them.

THREE: Initially, ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is from the minor kufr, just like taking ribaa', fornicating, stealing and the likes and it falls into the second category listed above. And this is the Ijmaa' of the Ummah.

And this has been reported from Ibn Abbaas and his associates – and the narrations in this regard are too famous to be mentioned – and it is also the general explanation of the Sahaabah

Ibn al-Qayyim said, “And this is the explanation (ta'weel) of Ibn 'Abbaas and the generality of the Companions regarding the speech of Allaah, **“And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers”** (5:44). Ibn Abbaas said: “It is not the kufr that takes one out of the religion. Rather when he does it then it is only disbelief in that, and he is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah and the Last Day”. And Taawoos said the same and Ataa said, “It is disbelief less than disbelief, oppression less than oppression and rebellion less than rebellion.” (Madaarij us-Saalikeen 1/344).

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah also said in his book 'As-Salaat wa Hukmu Taarikihaa' (pp.55-57): “As for ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and abandoning the prayer, then it is from the kufr of action absolutely and it is not possible for the label of kufr to be negated from them after Allaah and His Messenger applied it to them.

Therefore, the ruler who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed is a kaafir (disbeliever) and the one who abandons the prayer is a kaafir (disbeliever) due to a textual [ruling] of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) – however, it is the kufr (disbelief) of action, not the kufr of belief. And it is impossible for Allaah, free is He from all imperfections, to name a ruler who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed a kaafir and [yet at the same time] not apply the label of kufr to him...”

Then later he said: “...And this detailed explanation (tafseel) is the saying of the Companions, those who are the most knowledgeable of the Ummah of the Book of Allaah, and of Islaam, Kufr and their attributes and manifestations. Therefore, [the understanding] of these matters are not to be acquired except from them, since those of later times did not understand their intent and therefore, became divided into two groups: i) a group who expelled [others] from the religion due to major sins and judged that those guilty of such sins would remain in the fire eternally ii) a group who made them [the sinners] as believers, having perfect eemaan!!

Therefore, the first have exaggerated and the latter ones have turned away.

And Allaah guided the Ahl us-Sunnah to the most exemplary path and most balanced saying which compared to the various schools of thought is like Islaam compared to the other religions. So there is the lesser kufr (kufr doon kufr), the lesser nifaaq (nifaaq doon nifaaq), the lesser shirk (shirk doon shirk) the lesser fusooq (fusooq doon fusooq) and the lesser dhulm (dhulm doon dhulm).”

Then he mentioned the narrations reported from the Salaf in explanation of His, the Most High’s saying, “And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the disbelievers.” (5:44) – so he [Ibn al-Qayyim] said, “From Ibn ‘Abbaas – with numerous chains of narration – from Taawoos and ‘Ataa that this ruling [referred to in this verse] is the lesser kufr (kufr doon kufr)... then he said: “And this is clear and evident in the Qur’aan for the one who understands it, for Allaah – free is He from imperfection – has called the ruler who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed a kaafir (disbeliever) and also called the one who resisted and opposed (jaahid) what He revealed to His Messenger a kaafir (disbeliever). But these two [types of] kufr are not the same...” End quote from Ibn al-Qayyim.

And Shaikh ul-Islaam also quotes the view of Ibn ‘Abbaas regarding his verse on 4 different occasions in his book Kitaab ul-Imaan, quoting also the statements of the associates of Ibn ‘Abbaas, affirming and corroborating all of that. And Ibn al-Qayyim also quotes the view of Ibn ‘Abbaas as being the tafseel of the generality of the Companions as occurs in his Kitaab us-Salaat, following his declaring ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be from the kufr of action only (minor kufr) which has been quoted above.

Despite that, a new breed of hidden Kharijites have emerged who have attempted to dispute all of this and make it subject to debate and contention.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said, ‘Shaikh al-Albaanee has used this athar (narration) of Ibn ‘Abbaas (radiallaahu anhu) as proof, and likewise other Ulamaa have taken this athar with acceptance, even there is in its chain of narration what there is¹. Nevertheless, they have taken it with acceptance, due to its truthfulness in its reality, as indicated in many texts. For the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, “Reviling a Muslim is fusooq (sinfulness) and fighting him (to kill him) is kufr”, yet despite this, his fighting against him does not expel a person from the religion, for the Most High has said, “And if two parties from amongst the Believers fight each other, then reconcile between them...” up until he said, “...Verily the Believers are brothers, so reconcile between your two (sets of) brothers”. However, when this did not please those who have been put to trial (maftooneen) with takfir, they began to say, “This narration is not acceptable! It is not authentically related from Ibn ‘Abbaas!” So it is said to them, how can it not be authentic when it has been accepted and adopted by those who are greater than you and more knowledgeable of you of hadeeth?! And you say, “We shall not accept it”. If we were to accept that the matter was as you said (i.e. that we should not accept this athar), that it is not authentic from Ibn ‘Abbaas! Then we have many other texts that indicate that kufr can be applied to something without the kufr that expels from the religion being intended by that, such as what occurs in the verse mentioned before and also as occurs in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam’s) saying, “There are affairs in my Ummah which are kufr: reviling the genealogy and wailing of the dead”. And we do not expel these from the Ummah. However, the affair is as it has been said, “A paucity in knowledge, and paucity in understanding the general principles (qawaa’id) of the Sharee’ah – as Shaikh al-Albaanee has said, may Allaah grant him success, in the beginning of his words – is what brings about this misguidance. And then there is another matter and this is the evil intent which often brings about this evil understanding, because when a person desires something, it will lead his understanding to that which he actually desires, and then he will make tahreef (distort) the texts based upon that. And from the well known principles of the Ulamaa’, is that they say, “Seek evidence then believe, but do not believe (first) and then seek evidence (to support that belief), and as a result, go astray”. Hence the causes are three a) paucity of Sharee’ah knowledge b) paucity of understanding of the Sharee’ah principles c) an evil understanding that is based upon an evil intent. As for the athar (narration of Ibn ‘Abbaas) itself, which has been mentioned previously, then it is sufficient for us that the most learned and skilled of the Ulamaa like Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, and others, then all of them have taken it with acceptance, and they speak by it, and they quote it, hence the narration is authentic.” (Fitnah of Takfir, p. 63-64).

And hence what has been reported from Ibn ‘Abbaas, in the various narrations from him and also from Ikrimah, Ataa and Tawus and others, then all of that is established and is the explanation of the companions in general and this has been transmitted through the Ummah, being accepted and adopted all along, up until our times. The narrations in this regard are too numerous to mention, but just as a sample:

Allaamah Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 751H) said: “And it is correct that judging by other than what Allaah has revealed is both types of kufr (disbelief) - kufr asghar (the minor disbelief) and

¹ Alluding to weakness in one of the routes of transmission.

kufr akbar (the major disbelief) - and [which of the two it is] depends on the condition of the ruler. If he believes in the obligation of judging by what Allaah has revealed in this situation but turned away from it - out of disobedience - and while acknowledging that he is deserving of punishment then this is kufr asghar. And if he believes that it is not obligatory and that he has a choice in the matter along with his firm belief that it is the judgement of Allaah - then this is kufr akbar - and if was ignorant in the matter or made an error then he is one who errs (mukhtee') and his ruling is as the same for those who err (i.e. one reward). (Madaarij us-Saalikeen 1/337)

Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan as-Sa'dee (d. 1376H) said: "Judging by other than what Allaah has revealed is among the actions of the People of Disbelief - and it can also take one outside of the religion. And that is when he believes in its legality and its permissibility. And it can sometimes be one of the major sins and from the actions of disbelief - the one who is guilty of it will receive a heavy punishment - and He said: "And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the wrongdoers (dhaalimoon)." Ibn Abbaas said: "Kufr less than kufr and dhulm less than dhulm and fisq less than fisq. It is dhulm akbar when it is declared permissible but it is a great sin when it is done without declaring it permissible." [Tayseer al-Kareem ar-Rahmaan 2/296-297]

Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee (d. 596H) said: "And the decisive speech in this regard is that whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed - while rejecting it [in belief] (jahahda) and he knows that it is Allaah who revealed it - as the Jews did - then he is a disbeliever. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed - inclining to his desires without rejecting it [in belief] then he is a dhaalim, faasiq and it has been reported from Alee bin Abu Talhah from Ibn Abbaas that he said: "Whoever rejects (jahada) what Allaah has revealed then he has disbelieved, and whoever affirms it (aqarra bihi) but does not judge by it - then he is a dhaalim, a faasiq." (Zaad al-Maysir 2/366)

Shaikh Muhammad Ameen ash-Shanqeetee (d. 1393H) said: "Know that the liberating stance in this topic is that kufr, dhulm and fisq, all of them can be used in the legislation with the intent of 'disobedience' at one time and with the intent of kufr that ejects from the religion another time'. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, turning away and contradicting the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and nullifying the rulings (ahkaam) of Allaah, then his dhulm, fisq, and kufr - all of them are disbelief that eject from the religion. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, whilst believing that he is committing a forbidden action and doing a reprehensible action, then his kufr, dhulm and fisq does not eject him from the religion. (Adwaa al-Bayaan 2/104)

Imaam ibn Abee Izz al-Hanafee (d. 792H) said: "And there is a matter which it is necessary to comprehend well - that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed can sometimes be kufr that ejects from the religion and sometimes a major or minor sin - or it can be 'metaphorical kufr' (kufran majaaziyyan) or 'minor kufr' - and this is in accordance with the state of the ruler. If he believes that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not waajib and that he has a choice in the matter - or if he despises it - while having conviction that it is the rule of Allaah, then this is the major kufr. And if he believes in the

obligation to rule by what Allaah has revealed and in this [particular] incident [he knows it to be the rule of Allaah] but he turns away from it - whilst acknowledging that he deserves punishment then he is a disobedient person and he is termed a disbeliever with the metaphorical type of kufr or the minor type of kufr. (Sharh Aqeedat it-Tahaawiyyah p. 363)

All of this indicates the “tafseel” (distinction, detail) of the Salaf on this issue, in that they distinguish between the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-I’tiqadee) and the kufr of action (al-kufr al-‘amali, or otherwise al-kufr al-asghar, the minor kufr). In opposition to this is the “itlaaq” (absolution, generalisation) that the Khawaarij fall into, and who do not adhere to this tafseel in order to arrive at the judgement of takfir. And they are the ones that Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen alluded to, those who wish to nullify the tafseel of the Salaf and to reject the explanation of Ibn ‘Abbaas and his associates. As for a detailed analysis of the chains of narration of these athaar, then that has been performed by the Muhaddith, Imaam al-Albaani, and others, and the athar of Ibn ‘Abbaas are actually saheeh and hasan due to the supporting narrations. **It is fruitless to debate this with the ignoramuses who have emerged in the current times and tried to make this matter subject to debate.**² For they have nothing to stand upon, are ignorant and what Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen has said in reply to them is a perfect, comprehensive answer, and it should not be exceeded.

Question 19: The abovementioned Tafseel that has been alluded to, what is its scope and what is it in reference to?

We clearly need to define here what is the scope of this Ijmaa’ (referred to above), and what does it relate to. This is when a ruler in an instance when he judges between two people in a dispute, does not judge with what is correct and judges in the favour of the wrong person – either due to intending oppression to that person (dhulm) or due to sin (fisq). So here he opposes the correct judgement that would be necessitated by the Book and the Sunnah and judges in the favour of the wrong person, deliberately, with a judgement that is wrong. Now, if a person does this once, or ten times, or a hundred times, or for a whole lifetime, this remains a major sin, and is counted as minor kufr.

Similarly, when someone judges by laws, or customs, or habits, or whatever it may be, outside of the Book and the Sunnah, then this too falls into the second category listed above – and the scholars require Istihlaal or I’tiqaad or Juhood and the likes, before making takfir. And included within this is judging by the secular laws of today (or those of the past!). This also comes under the scope of the abovementioned Ijmaa’. Hence,

² And amongst such ignorant pretenders in the West is one by the name of Abu Hudhayfah Yusuf al-Kanadie who is most appropriately and perfectly described by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in what has been quoted above from him. Some time last year (2000) after his chits were set ablaze when we made the Anbari Papers available, he wrote a 112 page document attempting to refute the aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah and to replace it with his own Kharijite aqeedah which he imbibed from Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and Safar al-Hawali. But he made a complete fool of himself and whoever wishes to see his foolishness being serialised may refer to GRV070007, GRV070008, GRV070009, GRV070011. In addition, his treachery, deceit, charlatanism and lies will be made apparent in a detailed treatment on the aathaar of Ibn ‘Abbaas on this topic, inshaa’llah, in the continuation of exposing his foolishness.

irrespective of whether what is judged by, whether it is a ancestral custom, or a transmitted habit, or a law of another land or culture or nation, or if you like “secular” laws – then all of that comes under what is considered to be other than what Allaah has revealed, and hence judging by it comes under the tafseel of the Salaf alluded to earlier.

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, **‘There is no doubt that the one who does not believe (i’taqada) in the obligation to rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever. Hence, whoever declares it permissible (istahalla) to judge amongst the people with what he considers to be justice, without following what Allaah has revealed, then he is a disbeliever. There is no nation except that it orders ruling with justice. And sometimes justice, as perceived by its senior leaders, can exist in its religion. Many of those who ascribe themselves to Islaam judge by their customs that Allaah has not revealed, such as the ancestral customs of the bedouins. And the chiefs (umaraa) were obeyed (in this) and they used to consider that it is desirable to judge by these such customs, without the Book and the Sunnah. And this is disbelief. For many people have accepted Islaam but along with this they do not judge except by their natural [inherited] customs, those that are ordered by those whom they obey. So if they know (‘arafoo) that it is not permissible to judge except by what Allaah has revealed and did not adhere to that, but in fact declared it to be lawful (istahalloo) for themselves to judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, then they are disbelievers. And if not [i.e. did not declare it lawful for themselves] then they are [merely] ignorant people – as has preceded about them’** Minhaaj us-Sunnah (5/130)

Then there is the saying of the Allaamah, Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan Aal ash-Shaikh, “...and it is forbidden to pass judgement (tahkeem) when the judgement is based upon a false (baatil) Sharee’ah which opposes the Book and the Sunnah, **such as the laws of the Greeks (Ahkaam Yoonaan) and those of Europe, and those of the Tartars, and their various legislative codes (qawaaneen) the source of which are their own opinions and desires. Similar to this are the various cultural and customary practices of the Bedouins.** Hence, whoever made it lawful to judge (istahalla) by [any of] this in the issues pertaining to blood, or other than it is a Kaafir. Allaah the Most High said, **‘And whosoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Unbelievers’** (5:44). And concerning this verse, some of the Mufasssiroon have said that the kufr intended here is the kufr that is lesser than the Major kufr (kufr doona kufr al-akbar), because they understood that this verse applies to whoever judges by other than what Allaah has revealed but does not make that lawful (ghayr mustahill). But they do not dispute amongst themselves regarding its application in general to the mustahill (one who makes it lawful), and that the kufr in this case is the one that expels from the religion.” (Minhaaj ut-Ta’sees, p.71).

The saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in his Fataawaa (1/80) dated 9/1/1385H – five years after Tahkim ul-Qawanin was published: “And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of ‘Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah’ is by judging to his Shari’ah and confining oneself to that whilst rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allaah gave no authority. And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement **whilst believing in**

the correctness (sihhah) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that **without belief (I'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz),** then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion.”

And Imaam Ibn Baaz said, “And whoever ruled by other than what Allaah has revealed (i.e. the secular laws) then he will not be in other than one of four situations:

- 1) The one who says: ‘I rule by this because it is superior to the Sharee’ah of Islaam.’ Such a one is disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief
- 2) The one who says: ‘I rule by this because it is like the Sharee’ah of Islaam, so ruling by it is permissible and ruling by the Sharee’ah is permissible’. Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief.
- 3) The one who says: ‘I rule by this and ruling by the Sharee’ah of Islaam is superior but ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is permissible (jaa’iz).’ Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of major disbelief.
- 4) The one who says: ‘I rule by this’ while he believes that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not permissible and who says that ‘the Sharee’ah of Islaam is superior and it is not permissible to rule by other than it’ but he is neglectful, or treats matters lightly, or does this action due to a reason which proceeds from his rulers, then he is a disbeliever in the sense of minor disbelief which does not eject from the religion - and it is considered one of the greatest of major sins.”

(Al-Hukmu bi-Ghairi Maa Anzalallaahu wa Usool ut-Takfeer p. 71/72)

Imaam Ibn Baaz was also asked, “What is the ruling upon [judging] by secular law [al-qawanin al-wad’iyyah]? And is it permissible to enact them? And does a ruler become a disbeliever by instituting these laws [sannihi lihadhihil-qawanin]?”

Shaikh Bin Baz’s answer: “When these laws are in agreement with the Shar’iah then there is no harm in that, such as when he institutes laws regarding the paths [of travel] and streets and other things which benefit the people and in which there is no opposition to the Shari’ah, - and [when] these things assist in the smooth running of the affairs, then there is no harm in them. As for those laws which oppose the Shari’ah then no [it is not permissible]. When he institutes these laws, the meaning of this is that there would be no hadd punishment for the fornicator and nor any punishment for the thief or the one who takes intoxicants. This is falsehood, and these laws are falsehood. When the one in charge declares them to be permissible (istahallaha), then he has disbelieved, when he states (qaala) that they are lawful (halaal), and there is no harm in them, this is what becomes kufr (disbelief). Whoever declares to be lawful (istahalla) what Allaah has made unlawful has disbelieved”. (Muraaji’at Fi Fiqh ul-Waqi’ as-Siyasi wal-Fikri (12) by ‘Abdullaah ar-Rifa’ee)

So all of this is clear that ruling by the secular laws, in greater or smaller amounts, still falls within the confines of the tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and that it can fall in between the major kufr and the minor kufr depending on the state and condition of the ruler (or other than him) in terms of belief and action.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 15

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 20: What are the main doubts used by the Qutubiyyah and Takfiriyyah?

So far, we have covered what relates to a judge or ruler not making the right judgement, similarly we have covered not ruling by the laws of Allaah, but by other than them, whether ancestral customs, habits or the “secular” laws of each age and era, in greater or lesser amounts. And in all of that the aforementioned tafseel of the Salaf (i.e. that of al-kufr al-i’tiqadee (juhood, istihlaal etc.) and al-kufr al-‘amali with respect to this issue) applies to these instances or situations. All of this is manifestly clear and there is no doubt concerning this at all. In the past, the Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah, used to make takfir in absolute terms, in the likes of these instances, and this was only because at that time, the Salafi da’wah and the Salafi manhaj was not widespread. In more recent times (over the last two decades or so) when the Salafi da’wah has spread and become more well known, the Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah know that they cannot hoodwink Ahl us-Sunnah anymore in this manner, since their saying will be known to be clearly the saying of the Khawaarij. To this end, they have some other doubts that they use.

The first of those is the play on the meaning of “tabdeel” which means “changing”. So here they say that making tabdeel of the laws of Allaah is major kufr, and does not fall into the tafseel of the Salaf (i.e. that of distinguishing between the kufr of belief and the kufr of action). They remain ambiguous as to what exactly they mean by “tabeel” and with this ambiguity, attempt to take out the case of “tabdeel” from the well known tafseel of the Salaf, whose explanation has preceded.

The second of those is the play on the meaning of “istibdaal” which means “replacement”. So now they say that whoever “replaces” the laws of Allaah with other laws, then such a one is a kaafir, with the major kufr, and this does not require the tafseel of the Salaf previously mentioned. And that Istibdaal is other than ruling by what Allaah has revealed,

as understood by the Salaf, and which they (the Salaf) considered as either kufr or dhulm or fisq. So they seek to expel the issue of istibdaal from falling into the tafseel of the Salaf, and declare it to be major kufr absolutely (i.e. the act in itself).

IMPORTANT NOTE: Bear in mind the difference between tabdeel (which we have called “changing” in the sense that one changes or alters the true nature of something) and between Istibdaal (which we have called “replacing”, in the sense that one replaces something with something else, i.e. substitutes something else for it). The former (tabdeel) is changing something intrinsically, and the latter (istibdaal) is merely replacing it with something else. This is why the Innovators are known as “Mubaddiloon”, that is those who actually change and disfigure the religion. Take note of the saying of Imaam al-Qurtubi, “So whoever changed (baddala) (i.e. made tabdeel) or altered (ghayyara) or innovated into the religion of Allaah that with which Allaah is not pleased with and for which He has granted no permission, then he will be amongst those who will be repelled from the Hawd, distanced from it, and whose faces will be blackened. And those who will be repelled and distanced most severely are those who opposed the Jamaa’ah of the Muslims (i.e. those upon the Straight Path), and who separated from their path, such as the Khawaarij in all their varying sects, the Raafidah in the variety of their misguidance and the Mu’tazilah in the varying desires found amongst them. **All of these are Mubaddiloon (Changers, Disfigurers) and Mu’tadi’oon (Innovators)...**” (Tafseer al-Qurtubi, 4/168).

The third of those is the play on the word “tashree” (legislation) or “taqneen”, “at-tashree’ al-aamm” (a general legislation) and distinguishing between this and between “ruling”, and then arguing that tashree’ (is the right of Allaah alone), hence whoever legislates has committed Shirk with Allaah.

Then they have other doubts based largely upon statements of the scholars that they misunderstand, misapply, or misinterpret. And the words of the scholars they use include those of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikhs Mahmood and Ahmad Shakir and others. And we will treat all of these in what is yet to come and illustrate that they are all upon the tafseel of the Salaf, in actual fact!!

Then there is another doubt related to the reference point of judgement, at-Tahaakum.

Then they also have doubts about Istihlaal and its true nature.

The above doubts arise because of the confusion as to what exactly are the meanings of these terms, and the exact reality that these terms point to. The ambiguity in the meaning and import of these words and terms, is actually used by the Qutubiiyyah, the Takfiriyyah and others to win over people who are unaware and ignorant.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Before we answer these doubts it is important to bear this phrase in mind and to keep it in the back of your head as you read through what follows: “Ahl us-Sunnah arrive at the judgement of takfir (upon both the act [i.e. that an act is major kufr] and the person) in this issue by adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf, whereas Ahl ul-Bid’ah, such as the Khawaarij and others, arrive at the judgement of takfir (upon both the act [i.e.

that an act is major kufr] and the person) by way of itlaaq (absolution, generalisation).” Remember this phrase and it will help you to actually figure out, what exactly is the nature of the dispute between Ahl us-Sunnah and the Qutubiyyah, Takfiriyyah, Azzaamiyyah and their likes. And you will also come to know that most of the Takfiriyyah and Qutubiyyah don’t even have a clue as to what they are actually upon or what they are even talking about!

Question 21: What is the issue concerning Tabdeel?

A very lengthy treatment of this particular doubt is found in MNJ050018, and you are strongly recommended to stop at this point in this document and go and read it first. If you want to understand this issue well, read MNJ050018, and then come back to this article. In essence, the Qutubiyyah and the remainder of the Kharijite Renegades are confused about the true and real meaning of tabdeel and the way in which it has been used by some scholars.

Tabdeel as it is correctly understood is to change a law of Allaah with another law and then claim that this new law is actually from Allaah. In this manner one has actually “**changed**” (or altered) the law of Allaah in the proper sense of the word, in the sense that one has disfigured it and claimed it to be something that it is not. This is the actual meaning of tabdeel. So whoever falls into this, then this person is a Kaafir with the major kufr, after the conditions for takfir have been fulfilled. There is no dispute concerning this. So whether someone does this with respect to only one law (as the Jews did with the issue of stoning the adulterer) or five, or ten or whatever, a person is a Kaafir, for claiming that something is from the law of Allaah which is not, and hence lying upon Allaah. This is what is explained by Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in his well-known statement in Majmoo al-Fataawaa 3/267, (which has been falsely used by the Qutubiyyah and the Khaarijiyyah to justify their falsehood).

However, tabdeel has also been used by other scholars to be synonymous with what is generally understood by “ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed”, and which has been covered earlier (i.e in reference to ruling by the secular laws or ancestral customs and the likes) – and without there being any link or connection to claiming that what one is ruling by is actually from Allaah. Hence, they include this within the well-known tafseel of the Salaf in which it is treated as either kufr, dhulm or fisq.

Ibn al-Qayyim said, “And as for the replaced law (al-hukm al-mubaddal) - **and that is ruling by other than what allaah has revealed** - then it is not permissible to implement it nor to act by it, and it is not permissible to follow it, and the one guilty of it (saahibuhu) is between (the states) of kufr (disbelief), fusooq (rebellion) and dhulm (oppression).” (Kitaab ur-Rooh p.394).

Imaam Ibn Baaz was asked: “Is replacement (of the Shari’ah) with the secular laws (tabdeel ul-qawaaneen) considered to be major kufr that expels from the religion?”.

He replied: “When he makes it permissible (istibaaha). When he makes it permissible to judge with a law other than the Shari’ah he becomes a disbeliever with the major kufr – if

he makes that permissible. As for when he does that for specific reasons, out of disobedience to Allaah, for the sake of bribery, or pleasing somebody, and knows that this is haraam, then this is kufr doona kufr (the minor kufr). As for when he does it while declaring it lawful (mustahillan lahu), then this is major kufr. As Ibn ‘Abbaas said concerning the saying of Allaah the Most High, **“And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the Kâfirûn (i.e. disbelievers - of a lesser degree as they do not act on Allâh’s Laws)”**. (Al-Ma’idah 5:44) – so he said, “This is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah, but it is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr)”. Meaning, when he declares it lawful (istahalla) to judge by the secular law, or declares it lawful to judge with such and such, and likewise, [when he makes it lawful] to judge with such and such Sharee’ah, then he is a kaafir.” (Hiwaar Hawla Masaa’il it-Takfeer Ma’a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz” and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine No. 94).

Hence, tabdeel in this meaning, falls back upon the tafseel of the Salaf, in that only the one who makes it lawful (istihlaal), or who considers it to be better or equal to Allaah’s law (i’tiqaad) or does not act upon it – and acts upon other than it - due to Juhood, then such a one is a Kaafir, but as for what is other than this then it is dhulm and fisq.

So this doubt is as flimsy as Sayyid Qutb’s knowledge of the Salafi Aqeedah and as his knowledge of the meaning of Laa Ilaaha Ilallaaha and as flimsy as his respect for Moosaa (alahis salaam) and his respect for Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and the Qutubiyyah have nowhere to flee and nowhere to hide with the exposition of the likes of this doubt. Either they acknowledge the correct meaning of tabdeel, as it is correctly understood, and hence we agree with them, that with this particular meaning (when someone claims that the law they are judging by is actually from Allaah, when it is not) then we agree, this is major kufr, and we do not need to condition this act with Istihlaal (making it lawful) in order for it to be considered as major kufr. Or they can persist in claiming that tabdeel is major kufr (while they intend by tabdeel in this context to be synonymous with ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed), in that case we throw them with the Khawaarij of old – due to their not adhering to tafseel in this matter – in opposition to our Scholars, past and present.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 16

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 22: What is the issue concerning Istibdaal?

This doubt is similar to the first, but only from certain angles. Again, the prominent Qutubi Intelligentsia have attempted to expel the issue of Istibdaal from the framework of the tafseel of the Salaf, by claiming that it is major kufr absolutely. This is based largely upon the premise that “replacing” the laws of Allaah is major kufr – for which they have no proof from the Salaf. In reality, this again is word play, since if what is meant by Istibdaal is that a person actually **changes** the laws of Allaah (as in what is meant by the correct understanding of tabdeel), claiming that the law that is being referred to is actually from Allaah (when it is not), then of course Istibdaal is major kufr, even if it is done only with one of the laws of Allaah. However, this is not what is meant by Istibdaal. What is meant by istibdaal is that a person makes something other than the law of Allaah as a reference point for judgement, and thus judges by other than what Allaah has revealed. In essence, Istibdaal, is synonymous with ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.

And hence, this istibdaal (replacement) can vary from **partial istibdaal** to **total istibdaal**. Meaning that a person, or a ruler, or a judge, or anyone for that matter, instead of judging to the Sharee’ah, judges to something else, either in a) specific issues, or a range of issues or b) in every single issue (in other words to a wholly different Sharee’ah altogether, in principle, taking that as a way to be followed). The above distinction between partial istibdaal and total istibdaal has been alluded by numerous scholars, and is also what is apparent when one brings their statements together.

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan stated, explaining the meaning of his statement in Kitaab ut-Tawheed (and his commentary upon the saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem), “...And it was then said after that that the one who **abolishes the Shari’ah entirely (nihaa’iyyan)**”¹

¹ When we say “abolish the Sharee’ah” or “banish the Sharee’ah”, then what does this mean? And of course the judgement will depend upon what is actually meant by “abolition” in the words used by

and puts another law in its place, that this is evidence (daleel) to show that he views the [secular] law to be better than the Sharee'ah, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir [emphasis given]. This is in the same book itself... however they only take [from the book] according to their own understanding of it and what is of benefit to them, yet they abandon the rest of the words. If they had read the words from the beginning, the matter would have become clear [to them].

Questioner: And the statement of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is [understood] in the same way?

Shaikh al-Fawzan: Yes, it is the same. His words mean **that the one who abolishes the Shari'ah** and puts in its place another law, **then this gives evidence that he considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah**. And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this." (Cassette: Questions and Answers on al-Haakimiyyah)²

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan said, during his critique of Dr. Khalid al-'Anbari, "This tabdeel that you have mentioned and which is kufr by Ijmaa' of the Muslims does not exist, but it is something that is assumed by you, none of the rulers of today speak of it³ and nor in the past⁴, but there is istibdaal, and this is choosing the secular laws as a replacement to the

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem. So if a Ruler says for example (or anyone for that matter), that we should not judge by Islaam, but by Communism – then whether he physically abolishes the Sharee'ah or not, he is a kaafir. Rather, even if he allows the mosques to remain, and the people to pray therein, and allows the Hijaab, and the many other aspects of the Sharee'ah, yet he says we should rule by Communism and that is the way to go, then such a one is a kaafir, irrespective of whether he physically totally abolished the Sharee'ah or not. And hence this judgement of takfir is based upon the well-known tafseel of the Salaf.

And if what is meant by "abolish the Sharee'ah" is that a Ruler completely and totally effaces Islaam and everything related to it, such that nothing of it remains, or is allowed to remain, and then brings another law to replace it totally, then that does not exist today. And if anyone fell into it, then his kufr returns back to the kufr of belief, since he did not do this except while he considered his law to be better or superior and so on, and this is indicated in the words of the likes of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan. In other words, this shows that this person holds other than the Sharee'ah to be superior and better, and hence upon the tafseel of the Salaf, this person is a kaafir.

² Shaikh Ali Hasan, said in at-Ta'reef wat-Tanbi'ah (p.70 1st edition), "And this fatwa (i.e. of Ibn Ibraaheem) has been carried by Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan - as some Kuwaiti brothers of ours have told me - having heard this from him directly, that he carries it to mean perfect and complete istibdaal (kaamilan) with the secular laws. As for some laws as opposed to others, in greater or lesser amounts, then this is carried upon the second and last fatwaa (of Ibn Ibraaheem) [i.e. where he specifies making them permissible and believing (i'tiqaad) in the correctness of that]".

³ The Shaikh is referring to the tabdeel in which it is claimed that what one is ruling by is actually from Allaah, when it is not. So the Shaikh is saying that this does not exist today amongst the Rulers, and this is correct. Similarly, what is also correct is that total istibdaal (i.e. abolition of the Sharee'ah in its entirety and putting something else in its place) also does not exist today either, and has vary rarely, if at all, even existed.

⁴ Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari replied to this saying, "As for the point that tabdeel in this particular form is not present today, then it is correct, and the Shaikh actually quoted my rejection of its existence. But as for negating its existence in what has passed then this is not correct. For the Jews

had performed this type of tabdeel. This is established in the books of the Sunnah. In the two Saheehs there occurs, “The Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said to them, ‘What do you find in the Tawrah for the one who commits adultery (zinaa)?’ They replied, ‘We disgrace them and they are lashed’.” And in Saheeh Muslim in the hadeeth of al-Baraa there occurs, “A Jew who was being punished with scalding hot water and being lashed was made to pass by the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and so he called them over. He said, ‘Is this what you find for the punishment of zinaa in your book?’ They replied, ‘Yes’.”

Hence, they ascribed what they themselves had invented of lashing and scalding to the Sharee’ah of Allaah, and they rejected the stoning to death that was mentioned in the Tawrah.

Abu Umar Ibn ‘Abdul-Barr said, “And in this hadeeth is evidence to show that they used to lie upon their Tawrah, and they would ascribe their lie to their Lord and to their Book, since they said that they find in the Tawrah that the adulterers should be lashed and scalded, whether they are married or not married. Yet in the Tawrah is something different, that is stoning of the married fornicators (i.e. adulterers).” (at-Tamheed 9/14).

For this reason al-Jassaas said, in explanation, “Whoever rejects (jahada) the judgement of Allaah, or judges by other than the rule of Allaah and then says, ‘This is the judgement of Allaah’ then he is a Kaafir, just like Banu Israa’eel became disbelievers when they did this.” (Refer to Ahkam ul-Qur’an).

Hence, when the Shaikh negates the existence of ‘tabdeel’ with its correct meaning, in the world of the rulers today, then he performs takfir based upon the prevailing situation (of today), save that he gives it different terminology and that is “Istibdaal”. But we do not contend with him in the terminology, since what is important is the various meanings and ideas that it carries. Rather, we differ with him in the manner that he arrives at the ruling of takfir of those who judge by the secular laws, in absolute terms. So he says, “This tabdeel that you have mentioned and which is kufr by Ijmaa’ of the Muslims does not exist, but it is something that you assumed by you, none of the rulers of today speak of it and nor in the past, but there is istibdaal, and this is choosing the secular laws as a replacement to the Islamic Sharee’ah, and abolishing the Sharee’ah law courts, and this is kufr also. This is because, the ruler **completely abolishes** the Sharee’ah, and puts in its place secular laws. So what then remains of Islaam? And he did not do this except that he adopts these laws while he considers them to be superior to the Sharee’ah. And you (i.e. al-Anbari) did not mention this, and nor did you make clear its ruling”.

And the truth of the matter is that I did mention it and I did not reject it. Rather, I refuted the one who makes takfir in absolute terms (alal itlaaq) in numerous places and then I gave a respite of five years to my opponent to bring me evidence that justifies takfir in absolute terms, [without tafseel]. Since there is no proof and hence, there is no takfir. And the basic principle is that a person’s Islaam remains until he exits from it with certainty, not by what only constitutes mere suspicion and doubts.

And when exactness and giving attention to detail is the required Sharee’ah practice in making judgement, especially in matters of difference in viewpoints and opinions, then can there be found any rulers today who associate themselves with Islaam who have abolished the Sharee’ah “**completely**” in the terminological usage of the Shaikh? The vast majority of them implement some of the Sharee’ah laws, whether a small amount or a large amount. And this is evident mainly in the various ministries and bodies which exist for the issuance of verdicts and for the organisation of the affairs of worship and also in the issues related to judgements in the personal affairs by the use of the Islamic Sharee’ah judgements.

The saying of the Shaikh, “And he (the ruler) did not do this except that he adopts these laws while he considers them to be superior to the Sharee’ah...” has in it something which makes binding something that is in fact not binding. In light of this explanation (of the Shaikh) about the cause (of the act) then it is possible for it to be said that a person did not commit adultery (zinaa) except that he considers it to be superior than chastity or that a person did not keep away from treachery because he considers it to be superior than trustworthiness.

Islamic Sharee'ah, and abolishing the Sharee'ah law courts, and this is kufr also. This is because, the ruler **completely abolishes (yunheehaa nihaa'iyyan) the Sharee'ah**, and puts in its place secular laws. **So what then remains of Islaam?** And he did not do this except that he adopts these laws while he considers them to be superior to the Sharee'ah." (Majallat ud-Da'wah no. 1749 4th Rabee ul-Awwal 1421)

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan also said, "I say: the kufr of the one who does not rule by what Allaah has revealed, is not restricted to juhood, rather it also applies to **complete replacement (bal, yatanaawal al-istibdaala at-taamm)**, and likewise, the one who makes istihlaal of this action, even if only in some laws, and without him making juhood, or if he says: the judgement of other than Allaah is better than the judgement of Allaah, or if he says: that they are both equal, as the people of knowledge have textually stated (concerning this). Until even if he said, that the judgment of Allaah is better, but it is permissible to judge by other than it..." (Majallat ud-Da'wah no. 1749 4th Rabee ul-Awwal 1421)

So in the above we find that Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan has explained the view of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in that it relates to when a ruler replaces the Sharee'ah in its entirety and brings something else in its place. And likewise the Shaikh has also explained his own view that total istibdaal is major kufr (because it indicates what is being held of the beliefs of kufr in the heart) – and that what is less than that, then it requires Istihlaal or an associated belief that is expressed which necessitates kufr (such as considering it to be equal to or better than the Sharee'ah). And this can be reconciled with what has been stated by Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in what has been quoted from him earlier (in a previous answer), and also, Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan Aal ash-Shaikh and also Shaikh Ibn Baaz, who in their statements concerning ruling by the secular laws explain that having belief in their correctness and the permissibility of judging by them or making istihlaal of them is what necessitates kufr, not merely judging by them or to them.

There is also the saying of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee, "And by this it is known that the halaal (lawful) is what Allaah has declared lawful and the haraam (unlawful) is what Allaah has declared unlawful, and the deen (religion) is what has been legislated by Allaah. Therefore, every legislation (tashree') from other than Him is falsehood, and acting upon it – instead of (badala) the legislation of Allaah, **for the one who believes that it is equivalent to it, or better than it** – is clear, manifest kufr, there being no doubt in it". (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 7/162).

However, we can mention here the explanation of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen about the cause of the act, when he says, "And it is **in my opinion (dhann)** that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish such laws that oppose the Shari'ah and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement **except that he declares this to be permissible (istahallahu) and holds the belief (ya'taqidu) that such laws are better the Shari'ah laws**. Hence, he is a disbeliever. **This is what is apparent, and if not then what [motive] is it that carried him to undertake this? Sometimes it can be his fear of other people, when he does not implement these (secular laws), that carries him to do this. So in this situation we would say he is compromising with them, and hence we would say that he is like the one who compromises with respect to the other sins.**" (Fitnah of Takfir, p. 72)." End quote from al-Anbari (Paper: The Murji'ah Do Not Accept Us).

However, in the view of some scholars, even tabdeel (used in the sense of “replacing” and not “altering” or “changing”) or istibdaal (total) requires Istihlaal, and they do not consider that this act conclusively indicates that a person commits this act while he believes that a law other than Allaah’s is better and superior or while he declares it permissible. This is the view of Imaam Ibn Baaz and also Imaam al-Albaani and also Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari, and it is also the final view of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen⁵. They do not consider that this act can conclusively indicate that a person actually holds a law other than that of Allaah to be better. Rather, they hold that it is still possible for the operative motive to be dhulm, or fisq and the likes, and hence, make the judgement of takfir

⁵ Refer to MNJ050017 for full details. Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen has previously spoken of istibdaal and made it synonymous with ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, and he also made it fall back upon the tafseel of the Salaf.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said, “And ruling by other than what allaah has revealed is of two types:

The first type: that the ruler replaces (vastabdilu) the law of Allaah **the exalted by this law** whilst he has knowledge of the law of Allaah but he holds that the opposing law is more befitting and more beneficial for the servants than the rule of Allaah or that it is equal to the law of Allaah or that turning away from the law of Allaah is permissible (jaa’iz) - so therefore, he makes this law (qaanoon) the one that it is obligatory to refer back to for judgement (yajib at-Tahaakum ilaihi) - **so the likes of this one is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion** and that is because he is not pleased with Allaah as his Lord, Muhammad as his Messenger and Islaam as his religion **and the sayings of Allaah are applicable to him:**

Do they then seek the judgement of (the Days of) Ignorance? And who is better in judgement than Allâh for a people who have firm Faith. (Maa’idah 5:50)

Whosoever does not rule by what Allaah has revealed then they are the disbelievers [kaafiroon]. (Maa’idah 5:44)

The second type: that he replaces (vastabdilu) the law of Allaah **the exalted with an opposing law in a specific issue**, without making that a law (qaanoon) to which it is obligatory to refer to in judgement - **then he is in one of three conditions:**

The first condition: that he does this knowing the rule of Allaah the Exalted, whilst holding the belief (i’taqada) that the opposing law is more befitting than it and more beneficial for the servants, or that it is equal to it, or that turning away from the rule of Allaah is permissible, **so this one is a kaafir with the kufr which ejects from the religion as has preceded in the first category (above)**

The second condition: that he does this knowing the rule of Allaah, believing that it is more befitting and more beneficial but he opposes it due to intending harm to the one (in whose case he is judging) - or in order to benefit the one (in whose case he is judging), so such a one is a dhaalim and is not a kaafir and it is about him that the saying of Allaah the Exalted was revealed: “and whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the dhaalimoon (oppressors)”

The third condition: that it is the same as above, but he opposed it due to a desire in his soul, or for a certain benefit that he would accrue, so this one is a faasiq (rebellious) and is not a kaafir and it is about him that the verse was revealed: “and whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the faasiqoon (rebellors)”

(Majmoo Fataawaa Ibn Uthaimeen 2/104-106)

dependent upon the expression of Istihlaal (making lawful) and also I'tiqaad (beliefs which necessitate kufr) and Juhood and what is similar to that.

Imaam Ibn Baaz was asked: "Is replacement (of the Shari'ah) with the secular laws (tabdeel ul-qawaaneen) considered to be major kufr that expels from the religion?"

He replied: **"When he makes it permissible (istibaaha). When he makes it permissible to judge with a law other than the Shari'ah he becomes a disbeliever with the major kufr – if he makes that permissible.** As for when he does that for specific reasons, out of disobedience to Allaah, for the sake of bribery, or pleasing somebody, and knows that this is haraam, then this is kufr doona kufr (the minor kufr).

As for when he does it while declaring it lawful (mustahillan lahu), then this is major kufr. As Ibn 'Abbaas said concerning the saying of Allaah the Most High, "And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the Kâfirûn (i.e. disbelievers - of a lesser degree as they do not act on Allâh's Laws)". (Al-Ma'idah 5:44) – so he said, "This is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah, **but it is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr)**". Meaning, "when he declares it lawful (istahalla) to judge by the secular law, or declares it lawful to judge with such and such, and likewise, [when he makes it lawful] to judge with such and such Sharee'ah, then he is a kaafir."

Then the questioner said: "Is there a difference between replacement (tabdeel) and between ruling in a particular issue? Tabdeel O Shaikh?"

To which the Shaikh replied: **"If he does not desire (lam yaqsud) Istihlaal (making it lawful) by that, but did it due to some other reasons, then this is kufra doona kufr (the minor kufr).** As for when he says, 'There is no harm in judging by what Allaah has revealed', even if he said that the Sharee'ah is better, however, he says, 'there is no harm in this, it is permissible', he is declared a disbeliever on account of that with the major kufr, regardless of whether he says that the Sharee'ah is still better, or it is equal to the Sharee'ah, or that it is better than the Sharee'ah, then all of this is (major) disbelief."

The questioner said: "Meaning, this ruling (that you have explained) encompasses both tabdeel (replacement of the Sharee'ah) and other than tabdeel. It covers all of the types?"

The Shaikh replied: **"It encompasses all of the forms, it is in all of the forms."** (Refer to the book, "Hiwaar Hawla Masaa'il it-Takfeer Ma'a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz" and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine No. 94)

And also the saying of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimin (concerning those who bring other Sharee'ahs and then judge the people by them, and impose them upon the people):

"As for what is connected to [the issue of] ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, then it is, as occurs in the Mighty Book, divided into three types: that which is kufr

(disbelief), that which is dhilm (oppression) and that which is fisq (sinfulness) – all in accordance with the various reasons upon which this judgement is made:

1. So if a person judges by other than what Allaah has revealed due to following his desires, alongside his knowledge that the truth lies in what Allaah has decreed, then such a one does not disbelieve, however he is either a faasiq (sinner) or a dhaalim (oppressor).
2. **Or when he legislates (yusharri'u) a general ruling (hukman 'aamman) which the Ummah [adopts and] traverses upon, and he considers this to be of benefit (maslahah), and he is caught up in [confusion about it], then he does not disbelieve either**, because many of the rulers have ignorance of the knowledge of the Sharee'ah and one who does not know the Sharee'ah ruling is often connected to them (i.e. by their side) and they (the rulers) consider such a one to be a great scholar, and opposition [to the Sharee'ah] occurs as a result of all of this.
3. **And if he knows the legislation (Shar') however he judges by this [legislation] or he legislates this [law] and then makes it a code of law (dustoor) to be followed by the people, believing (ya'taqid) that he is an oppressor (dhaalim) in all of that and that the truth is what has come in the Book and the Sunnah, then we are not able to make takfir of this one.**
4. **But we make takfeer of:**
 - i) the one who holds that the a legislation other than Allaah's is more appropriate for the people to be upon
 - ii) or the one who believes that this legislation is equivalent to the legislation of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic

It is this one who is a disbeliever **because he is a mukhaddhib (makes takdheeb)** of the saying of Allaah, the Blessed and Almighty, **"Is not Allaah the Best of all Judges?"** and also His saying, **"Is it the judgement of Jaahiliyyah they seek. And who is a better judge than Allaah for a people of sure (faith)?"**. End quote. (In answer to Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri's questions via telephone. Refer to MNJ050017).

And also what was asked to Shaikh 'Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad, in the Islamic University of Madinah, during his lesson, 'Sharh Sunah Abu Dawood' on 16/11/1420H, "Is Istibdaal (replacing) the Islamic Sharee'ah with the Secular Laws (al-qawaneen al-wad'iyyah) kufr in and of itself? Or does it require the Istihlaal of the heart of belief (I'tiqaad) in its permissibility? And is there a difference between ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one instance, and between making the secular laws (al-qawaneen) as general legislation (tashree'an aamman), while one believes that this is not permitted?"

So the Shaikh replied, “It is clear that there is no difference between ruling in a matter, or ten or a hundred or a thousand, or less or greater than that. There is no difference as long as a person considers himself to be in error, that he is doing what is evil (munkar), and that he is committing disobedience, and that he is fearful of sin, so this is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr). And as for Istihlaal, even if it was only in one matter, so he makes it lawful to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed, and considers it to be lawful, then this is kufr.”

Summarising the above, there is

- a) total replacement (al-istibdaal at-taam) or replacement in principle
- b) partial istibdaal.

Those who speak of total replacement negate the requirement of Juhood (rejection) and Istihlaal for declaring this act to be major kufr, and argue that this act (of totally effacing the Sharee’ah, in its entirety, such that nothing remains of Islaam, and its subsequent replacement with another, entirely different Sharee’ah) gives evidence (daleel) that such a person holds this other law to be better than that of Allaah, and hence it is kufr. And we hold that this is indeed correct and true – even though this form does not even exist, but if it did such that a ruler effaced Islaam totally, then it would be major kufr. And this is in perfect conformity with the tafseel of the Salaf alluded to earlier, since this kufr is the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i’tiqadee). An important thing to note here is that Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem placed the setting up of law courts and institutions which judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, (the basis of all of them being the secular laws of the disbelievers and the likes) under the category of “al-kufr al-i’tiqadee” in his book Tahkeem al-Qawaaneen⁶.

As for others (Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, Shaikh Ibn Baaz etc.) then they require the expression of belief, or Istihlaal before this tabeel, or istibdaal (or at-tashree’ ul-aamm) is considered as major kufr.

However, regardless of which of the two views one takes, they both conform to the tafseel of the Salaf, since those who do not require Istihlaal for total replacement state that this is

⁶ Shaikh Ali Hasan quotes Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan bin Mu’allaa al-Luwaihiq in his book “al-Ghuluww Fid-Deen” concerning the six types of kufr in belief mentioned by Shaikh Ibn Ibraheem in Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen (p.291), “That which is apparent, and Allaah knows best, is that he – rahimahullaah – mentioned the first four types with expressions that indicate that they are in conformity with the rules and principles of making takfir of a specific and known individual (muy’ayyan) from amongst the Rulers, and this is why he used words which are in reference to a specific person. So he said, “... **that he rejects (An yajhada)**” and also “... **that he believes (An ya’taqida)**”... And as for the last two types, then he has intended “takfir an-nau’ (takfir by way of type, or takfir of the action)” by them. For this reason (in these latter two cases) **he has made his words revolve around the actual action (fi’l) itself, not the doer (faa’il)**. And built upon this, it is necessary, in the case of making the takfir of a specific individual who has fallen into any of the last two types, **that reference is made to the principles contained in the first four types**”. (Refer to Saihatu Nadheer p.97).

kufr because it gives evidence (daleel) as to what the heart contains of the beliefs that necessitate kufr. And all of this indicates that the true nature of the difference between the two views is actually based upon whether the act (of total replacement) itself conclusively indicates the existence of beliefs of kufr (and hence the judgement of major kufr) without us even investigating into the beliefs of the ruler – or whether it is plausible for this act to have arisen due to other factors, such as intending dhulm (oppression) or fisq (sin) and the likes (and hence there is no judgement of major kufr, unless we investigate into the reasons behind this act and come to know that it is Istihlaal or believing that the law is better or equal to the Sharee'ah and so on).

Either way, both of these views are based upon the tafseel of the Salaf that in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, there is al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee and also al-kufr al-'amali – and those who hold total replacement to be major kufr, actually include this within al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee and explain it to be indicative of what the heart contains of beliefs of kufr (without that being Istihlaal OR Juhood). Both of these views arrive at the judgement of takfir based upon the tafseel of the Salaf. To the Qutubiyyah, this would necessitate the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan and that of the Extremist Murji'ah!!

Pay very careful attention to this point! The true nature of the difference lies in the absence or presence of the plausibility of this act having occurred for reasons other than those which necessitate kufr (i.e. intending excessive dhulm, fisq etc. rather than believing the foreign law to be better or equal to Allaah's law or declaring it permissible). So some scholars believe there is a plausibility (such as one being forced to compromise⁷, or due to dhulm and the likes) and hence they specify Istihlaal and expression of the I'tiqaad. But other scholars do not hold this plausibility and say that it conclusively indicates the beliefs of kufr, and is therefore major kufr. Either way, this demolishes and exposes the great scandal of the Qutubiyyah Jadeedah and also the great fraud perpetrated by Mohammad Qutb and his puppet, Safar al-Hawali in their bid to accuse the whole Ummah with Irjaa'. In reality their view necessitates Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem has fallen into Irjaa', Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan has fallen into Irjaa', Imaam ash-Shanqeetee has fallen into Irjaa'! Let alone Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani and Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen!

As for partial replacement, then that also falls under the well-known tafseel of the Salaf as has preceded and is synonymous to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, by the secular laws and their likes. In summary, there is no proof for the Qutubiyyah, Takfiriyyah, since the tafseel of the Salaf applies to Istibdaal, and what is differed over is

⁷ Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said, "And it is **in my opinion (dhann)** that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish such laws that oppose the Shari'ah and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement **except that he declares this to be permissible (istahallahu) and holds the belief (ya'taqidu) that such laws are better than the Shari'ah laws.** Hence, he is a disbeliever. This is what is apparent, and if not then **what [motive] is it that carried him to undertake this?!** **Sometimes it can be his fear of not undertaking this act on account of people who are stronger than - that makes him undertake this act. So here he would be compromising with them. So here we would say that such a one is like those who compromise with respect to the other sins.**" (Fitnah of Takfir, pp.73-74).

Refer to the Shaikh's statement dated 22/03/1420H – and it has been quoted above in the main body of this document.

actually total Istibdaal, which does not even exist, and even then the difference on this issue is not what they actually think it to be!! They think total replacement of the Sharee'ah is like the other acts of major kufr (like kicking the Qur'aan etc.) and hence any attempt to attribute the kufr in this act to what the heart contains of beliefs that necessitate kufr is the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan in their view. Yet our Ulamaa (like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others) say that this act gives evidence (daleel) that the person considers this other law to be superior to the Sharee'ah and therefore it is kufr!! Hence, this is takfir of the act, based upon the tafseel of the Salaf! Our Ulamaa are in one valley. And the Outubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Takfiriyyah are on a different planet. Wallaahul-Musta'aan.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 17

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 23: What is the issue concerning Tashree' and Taqneen?

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said, "...then built upon this, our ta'weel (explanation of this verse [5:44]) is based upon what has been mentioned, that we judge that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not the kufr that expels from the religion. However, it is the kufr of action, since the haakim, by committing this, has deviated from the correct way. And it is not to be differentiated in that between a man who takes a secular law (qaanoon wad'iyy) from others and then makes it a referent point for judgement in his state (yuhakkimuhu fee dawlatihi), and between one who devises his own law (qaanoon), and then puts this secular law in place. Since, the most important thing is: Does this law oppose the Heavenly Law or not?" (Fitnat ut-Takfir, p.78, of Shaikh al-Albani, compiled by Shaikh Ali Hasan).

Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribi said, "Sometimes, one amongst them (the Qutubiyyah, Takfiriyyah) might say, "We hold onto the tafseel (clarification, distinction) of the Salaf on this matter, we hold on to the tafseel of the Salaf, and we do not reject it. But we hold this tafseel on the issue of ruling (al-hukmu) by other than what Allaah has revealed. But as for legislating (at-tashree') by other than the judgement of Allaah, we do not hold this tafseel." These words of theirs are actually nothing but polemics and philosophy, because, there is no real difference behind these words, since the one who judges (hakama) by other than what Allaah has revealed in a particular matter, then he has legislated (shara'a) a judgement other than Allaah's judgement in this issue. And whoever judges (hakama) by other than what Allaah has revealed and then makes this judgement binding upon the people is just like the one who legislated (shara'a) a judgement upon other than the legislation (shar') of Allaah and made it binding upon the people. What is this philosophy?" End quote. (Cassette: The Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine)

And this doubt is answered by the following:

Firstly: when someone makes a judgement in an affair, either based upon his own judgement (that opposes what Allaah has revealed) or based upon a law from somewhere else (that opposes what Allaah has revealed), then he has made 'tashree' in this issue. He has legislated a hukm (ruling) in this issue which opposes what Allaah has revealed.

Secondly: this doubt of 'tashree' (legislating) is presented by portraying 'tashree' **to be synonymous** with making lawful what Allaah has made unlawful and making unlawful what Allaah has made lawful, and also making it **synonymous** with holding the belief that the law which is being legislated (whether that be a ruler's own invention, or whether it is borrowed from other laws) is actually superior to the judgement of Allaah – and this does not bind at all.

This doubt is based upon the saying of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee, "...And as for the legislative code (Nidhaam ush-Shar'iyy) which is in opposition to the legislation of the Creator of the Heavens and Earth, then instituting it (takheemihi) is disbelief in the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth. Such as **the claim** that favouring the man over the women in the issue of inheritance is not from justice, or that it is necessary for them to be considered equal in receiving inheritance, or like **the claim** that polygamy is (a form of) oppression, or that divorce is oppressive for the woman, or that stoning (for adultery) and chopping (the hand for theft) are from the strange (backward) actions and that it is not permissible to apply them to a human being, **and other such (claims).**". (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 4/90).

Even though in this statement ash-Shanqeetee has clearly used the terms "the claim that", indicating that this is a matter of belief – hence, his judgement is based upon the expression of belief. Imaam ash-Shanqeetee makes this tafseel and says, "And by this it is known that the halaal (lawful) is what Allaah has declared lawful and the haraam (unlawful) is what Allaah has declared unlawful, and the deen (religion) is what has been legislated by Allaah. Therefore, every legislation ('tashree') from other than Him is falsehood, and acting upon it – instead of (badala) the legislation of Allaah, **for the one who believes that it is equivalent to it, or better than it** – is clear, manifest kufr, there being no doubt in it.". (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 7/162).

The Doctor, 'Abdul-Azeez bin Saalih at-Tuwayyaan wrote an Academic Paper entitled, "Juhood Shaikh Muhammad al-Ameen ash-Shanqeetee Fee Taqreer Aqeedat us-Salaf" (The Striving of Shaikh Muhammad al-Ameen ash-Shanqeetee in Corroborating the Aqeedah of the Salaf), which was given an introduction by both Shaikh Salih al-'Ubood (the Director of the Islamic University of Madinah) and also Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad.

Dr. at-Tuwayyaan quotes the saying of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee, "Those who follow the secular laws which Satan has legislated upon the tongues of his allies, and which are in opposition to what Allaah, the Majestic and Exalted, has legislated upon the tongues of his Messengers (sallallaahu alaihim wasallam), then no one doubts about their kufr and Shirk,

except one whose eyesight Allaah has blinded from the light of revelation”¹ (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 4/90) And he then comments with the following note:

“And from this, the Shaikh’s resolute position towards the one who changed (ghayyara) the judgement of Allaah, and judged by the judgement of the Tawaagheet becomes clear, since he (the Shaikh) speaks of the kufr of such a one, rather the kufr of the one who doubts in the kufr of such a one. And the position of the Shaikh (rahimahullaah) is not to be taken absolutely (‘alaa itlaaqihi), since we see him explaining in other places, when ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed becomes the kufr that expels from the religion, and when the person who commits it is a sinner who falls into what is haraam, and which does not expel him from Islaam. So he says (rahimahullaah), ‘Kufr, dhulm and fisq, all of them can be used in the legislation with the intent of 'disobedience' at one time and with the intent of 'kufr that ejects from the religion another time'. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, turning away and contradicting the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and nullifying the rulings (ahkaam) of Allaah, then his dhulm, fisq, and kufr - all of them are disbelief that eject from the religion. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, whilst believing that he is committing a forbidden action and doing a reprehensible action, then his kufr, dhulm and fisq does not eject him from the religion. (Adwaa al-Bayaan 2/104)”. And the view of the Shaikh is the view of the notable scholars before him, such as Ibn al-Qayyim (rahimahullaah)... and from this detailed tafseel from Ibn al-Qayyim (rahimahullaah) in this matter we come to know the agreement of Shaikh al-Ameen’s aqeedah with the aqeedah of the Salaf before him, and also his striving (rahimahullaah) to corroborate the aqeedah of the Salaf and traversing upon it and following their way becomes clear.” (Juhood Shaikh ash-Shanqeetee Fee Taqreer Aqeedat us-Salaf pp.182-183).

Therefore the issue of taqneen and tashree’, itself has the tafseel of the Salaf applied to it – and mere tashree’ and tahkeem in and of itself is not sufficient to warrant major kufr, and nor to warrant takfir. If someone **claims** that what he is judging by (whether that is from his own legislation, or from somewhere else), that it is better than what Allaah has revealed, or equal to it, then such a one is a kaafir. Likewise, if someone **claims** that cutting off the hands of the thief and stoning the adulterer is barbaric (and hence judges by other laws that do not involve cutting off the hands) then such a one too is a kaafir. And all of this is related to belief (I’tiqaad), which cannot be known unless it is expressed. Hence, the issue of tashree’ and taqneen has the same tafseel as ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.

Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Ma’ribi stated, “And yet this ruler alongside his ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, it has not become apparent to us, and nor to the opposer, it has not become clear to us that he has made it explicit that his judgement is better than the judgement of Allaah, or that it is permissible for him to judge alongside Allaah’s

¹ And this position of the Shaikh is not to be taken absolutely, without tafseel, as we shall see, since this would necessitate the takfir of those who do not consider that replacement (istibdaal) of the Sharee’ah with other laws is major kufr except by way of Istihlaal and I’tiqaad, and this includes Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Uthaimin, Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-‘Abbaad and many many others from Ahl us-Sunnah.

(judgement), or that his judgement is equivalent to the judgement of Allaah and other such expressions which the Salaf, may Allaah be pleased with them, have explained.

And if you were to ask the opposer, “Have you heard this man say that his judgement is better than the judgement of Allaah, or other such words” he will say, “If he believed that Allaah’s judgement is better than his own, then why does he judge by it (his own judgement)?” Now this answer, it does not necessitate that he makes his judgement superior to that of Allaah’s and nor that he equates between his judgement with that of Allaahs’ and nor does it necessitate that he has made it permissible for himself to legislate alongside Allaah.

For the sinners who commit shameful deeds and major sins, if the words of our opponent was correct and sound, then we could also analogise it for the sinners, and so it could be said, “If he had not made istihlaal of zinaa (i.e. said it was lawful, as a matter of belief), he would not have committed zinaa. Why does he go and get married. Or if he was married, why is he not satisfied with his wife that Allaah has made lawful to him? So why does he enter into the haraam? He did not commit this except that he declared it lawful (as a matter of belief).”

Hence, when this is the affair that is reached by our opponent, it becomes binding upon him (by way of his argument) to make takfir on account of major sins. And this is the very saying of the Khawaarij without any dispute amongst Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah. Hence, this extremism and exaggeration in the issue of takfir is one of their manifest characteristics...²

...And if you were ask the one who says this, and you said to him, “What is the difference then?”. If he replied that the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed has the well-known tafseel applied to it, but the issue of legislating (at-tashree’) does not have tafseel in it, then say to him, “Has anyone from the Salaf said this before you? Name me a single person from the Salaf who said that the one who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed is different to the one who legislates by other than Allaah’s legislation. Name me one from the Salaf.”

So when he is not able to mention a single one from the Salaf, yet the verses relating to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed are present and those which censure those who legislate by other than Allaah’s legislation are all present in the Book, present in the Qur’aan, yet alongside that the Salaf did not make note of this matter which the opponent has made note of in the current times.

And this in itself is sufficient to show that this distinction and this categorisation is a newly-introduced matter, to which no attention is given. Hence, exaggeration and extremism in this issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is a manifest

² This is exactly what Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and Nasir al-Umar and others from the Qutubiyyah fell into!! As has been detailed elsewhere, so refer to it. And this was one of the reasons why Imaam al-Albaani labelled them “The Khawaarij of the Era”.

characteristic of these people.” End quote from Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Ma’ribi. (Cassette: The Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine).

And to illustrate this more clearly, a ruler might make a legislation allowing the existence of banks that deal in ribaa (usury) – and this could be from the point of view of his wanting to consume ribaa, that is fisq. This legislation does not indicate that the ruler considers the taking of ribaa to be lawful (istihlaal), nor does it conclusively indicate that the ruler considers the taking of ribaa to be better than what is in the Sharee’ah judgement, namely that it is unlawful. So the point here is that mere tashree’ and taqneen, in and of itself, is not sufficient in order to pass the judgement of major kufr (upon an act) and of takfir (upon an individual). Since, the operating motive behind this could be dhulm, or fisq, as well as kufr. Similarly, if a judge or a ruler, knowing the punishment for someone who has stolen, and knowing that someone has indeed stolen and is guilty, decides that he should be whipped instead of having his hand cut off, then he has legislated (tashree’) a judgement (hukm) in this issue, which is other than the judgement of Allaah. However, this does not necessitate that he has considered this lawful and nor that whipping is better, and nor that cutting the hand is barbaric. Since, the operating motive behind this could be fisq, or to favour the one upon whom he is imposing punishment (while he knows Allaah’s judgement of cutting off the hands to be better and superior, and that it is obligatory to judge by it and so on).

Imaam Ibn Baaz was asked, “What is the ruling upon [judging] by secular law [al-qawanin al-wad’iyyah]? And is it permissible to enact them? And does a ruler become a disbeliever by instituting these laws [sannihi lihadhihil-qawanin]?”

Shaikh Bin Baz’s answer: “When these laws are in agreement with the Shar’iah then there is no harm in that, such as when he institutes laws regarding the paths [of travel] and streets and other things which benefit the people and in which there is no opposition to the Shari’ah, - and [when] these things assist in the smooth running of the affairs, then there is no harm in them. As for those laws which oppose the Shari’ah then no [it is not permissible]. When he institutes these laws (idhaa sanna qaanoonan), the meaning of this is that there would be no hadd punishment for the fornicator and nor any punishment for the thief or the one who takes intoxicants. This is falsehood, and these laws are falsehood. When the one in charge declares them to be permissible (istahallahaa), then he has disbelieved, when he states (qaala) that they are lawful (halaal), and there is no harm in them, this is what becomes kufr (disbelief). Whoever declares to be lawful (istahalla) what Allaah has made unlawful has disbelieved” (Muraaji’aat Fi Fiqh ul-Waqi’ as-Siyasi wal-Fikri (12) by ‘Abdullaah ar-Rifa’i).

So in short, all of this indicates that the issue of tashree’ is merely a play with words and making binding upon this term what is not actually binding. In reality, the issue of tashree’ (legislating), also falls back upon the tafseel of the Salaf.

Then another doubt related to this is that they say that tashree’ is the right of Allaah alone and that anyone who contends with him in this regard is contending with his Uloohiyyah and his Ruboobiyyah. So they tie this matter together with the issue of Uloohiyyah and

Ruboobiyyah, and this is indeed correct. However, it is also correct for a single matter, and it is correct for ten matters and it is correct for at-tashree' ul-aamm (general legislation). Hence, it can be argued that anyone who did not rule by what Allaah has revealed in a single matter has contended with Allaah in his Uloohiyyah and Ruboobiyyah since in judging with a judgement other than that of Allaah, he has contended with Allaah's Uloohiyyah and Ruboobiyyah. This applies to even in a single issue. And of course, their distinguishing between this and between general legislation (at-tashree' al-aamm) has no basis.

What they do quote is the words of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee who says, "So associating with Allaah in His hukm (judgement) is like associating with Allaah in his ibaadah (worship). He said concerning his judgement **"And He does not let anyone share in His judgement"** and in the reading of Ibn 'Aamir from the seven (readings), **"And do not associate (anyone) with Allaah in His judgement"** and this in the form of a prohibition. And concerning Shirk in his worship he said, **"And whoever hopes in the meeting with His Lord, then let him work righteous deeds and in the worship of his Lord associate none as a partner"**, hence both the matters are the same".³ (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 7/162)

However, on the very same page, ash-Shanqeetee clarifies this and conditions this and so he says immediately after, "And by this it is known that the halaal (lawful) is what Allaah has declared lawful and the haraam (unlawful) is what Allaah has declared unlawful, and the deen (religion) is what has been legislated by Allaah. Therefore, every legislation (tashree') from other than Him is falsehood, and acting upon it – instead of (badala) the legislation of Allaah, **for the one who believes that it is equivalent to it, or better than it** – is clear, manifest kufr, there being no doubt in it". (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 7/162).

And hence, there is no proof for them at all!! Let alone the fact that this type of logic can also be applied to all major sins. So for example the drinking of alcohol, it can be argued that whoever drinks alcohol has misappropriated the right of Allaah over his body, and has belittled and rejected the legislation of Allaah (in this matter). And we can take it a step further and say that whoever persists in drinking alcohol (or fornication or taking ribaa) and does this openly, then this proves that he has made istihlaal of his act and also considers it to be better and more superior as a way to be followed in opposition to what is in the Sharee'ah. And there is no doubt that the likes of this rhetoric leads to the saying of the Khawaarij, and this is exactly what the neo-Qutubiyyah fell into.

They also say that the legislating secular laws in general (both those that oppose the Sharee'ah and those that do not) entails making the claim to legislation, which belongs only to Allaah and it also entails misappropriating the right of Allaah, and also rejection of

³ And this is often quoted by the Qutubiyyah as follows, "And associating with Allaah in his judgement is like associating with Him in His worship. They are both with the same meaning, and there is no difference between them ever. Hence, the one who follows a code (nidhaam) other than the code of Allaah, and a legislation (tashree') other than the legislation of Allaah, then he is like the one who worships an idol and prostrates to a statue. There is no difference between them whatsoever, from any aspect, and they are both the same thing, both are Mushriks with Allaah".

the Sharee'ah. And again the reply to this is that when one does not judge by what Allaah has revealed in a single matter, then one has made the claim to legislation and has misappropriated the right of Allaah and has rejected the Sharee'ah, since in his judging by other than what Allaah has revealed in this matter (whether it be a law from himself, or another law, like French, or British or American), he has legislated a judgement and has rejected the Sharee'ah (in that issue), and has considered his own judgement to be better – so there is no difference, in principle. So again, what evidence is there to distinguish between this and that? There is no evidence.

And amongst the evidences they used to use were from the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthameen in which he distinguished between a single matter and between general legislation (as occurs in his Majmoo' al-Fataawaa), and that avails them nothing as the final viewpoint of the Shaikh, that which he settled on is that I'tiqaad and Istihlaal are required even for general legislation (at-tashree' al-aamm) and replacement of the Sharee'ah, refer to MNJ050017, for a very explicit answer from the Shaikh.

And also amongst the evidences they use is the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, “For if the ruler is pious, but he makes a judgement without knowledge, then he will be amongst the inhabitants of Hellfire. And if he knew (the judgement) but he judged in opposition to the truth which he knew, he will be amongst the inhabitants of the Hellfire. And when he judged without knowledge or justice, then it is more befitting that he should be amongst the inhabitants of Hellfire. This is when he makes a judgement concerning an affair in relation to a particular person. **As for when he makes a general ruling (hukman aamman) in the religion of the Muslims and makes truth into falsehood, falsehood into truth, sunnah into bid'ah and bid'ah into sunnah, the ma'roof into munkar and the munkar into ma'roof, forbids what Allaah and His Messenger have commanded and orders what Allaah and His Messenger have prohibited.** Then this is another manifestation, the Lord of all the Worlds, Diety of the Messengers and the Master of the Day of Judgement, to whom belongs praise in this world and the hereafter will pass judgement over it. “His is the Decision, and to Him you (all) shall be returned.” (Al-Qasas 28:88) “He it is Who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth (Islâm), that He may make it (Islâm) superior over all religions. And All-Sufficient is Allâh as a Witness. (Al-Fath 48:28).” Majmoo al-Fataawaa (35/388)

Then there is no judgement of takfir in this passage and nor any mention of major kufr! Rather, Shaikh ul-Islaam submitted the judgement upon this to Allaah the Most High. As for the Qutubiyyah and Takfiriyyah, then their judgement is all cooked and prepared, ready to be served on a plate!

They also have many other statements of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah which they claim support their views, and all of these statements do not in fact, support them at all. Perhaps they will be covered in a separate discourse.

Then they also have a doubt based upon the words of the two Shakir brothers.

Concerning the words of Mahmood Shakir which are used to support the notions of Qutubism, "... So whoever argued with these two narrations (i.e. of Abu Miljaz) out of context⁴ and distorted their meaning, seeking to defend his ruler, **or using them fraudulently to make it permissible to rule by other than what Allaah has revealed** and made incumbent upon His servants, then the Sharee'ah ruling upon him is the ruling of the one who willfully rejects one of the laws of Allaah (jahid). His repentance is to be sought, but if he persists and displays arrogance and wilfully denies the rule of Allaah (jahada hukmallaah) and is pleased with the replacement of the laws [of the Shar'eeah] (tabdil), then the ruling of a disbeliever, kafir, who is persistent upon his disbelief, is well known to the people of this religion." [Notes to Tafsir of at-Tabari 10/349].

And also the words of Ahmad Shakir in Umdat ut-Tafseer (4/151), "And these narrations – from Ibn 'Abbaas and others – are the ones which those who lead others astray play around with in this era of ours, from amongst those who ascribe themselves to knowledge, and other than them from those who are reckless towards the religion – **using them as an excuse for the permissibility of ruling by the invented secular paganistic laws...**"

The truth of the matter is that these narrations are in fact against them, not for them, for the Shaikhs are talking about the false use of these narrations "to make it permissible to rule by other than what Allaah has revealed" – and that the one who persists in doing so is a disbeliever. And this is indeed the truth and that which we hold as our religion!! For whoever makes istihlaal of ruling by the secular paganistic laws, he is a kaafir!! And likewise whoever makes juhood (rejection, as a matter of belief) then he too is a kaafir!!

As for the statement of Mahmood Shakir – also employed by the Qutubists - in which he states, "What we face today is the total desertion of Allah's law without exception and the preference of laws other than (in His) Book and the Prophet's Sunnah and a negation of all that is in Allah's Sharee'ah. **Indeed, the matter has reached [such proportions] that there are those who will argue for the preference of secular law above the Sharee'ah laws by arguing that laws of the Sharee'ah were intended for a specific period of time which has ended, and hence they are no longer valid.** What does this have to do with what is clarified by the statement of Abu Miljaz to a group of the Ibadiya among the tribe of 'Amr ibn Sadaas?"

Then a number of points need to be noted:

1. The claim of the Shaikh that there is "total" desertion of Allaah's Law, "without exception" and a "negation" of "all" that is in the Sharee'ah – then this statement is not factually correct and the truth is otherwise as has been pointed out in the words of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albani, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen and Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and

⁴ And this is concerning those who use these narrations to justify the act of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, seeking to make it permissible and claiming that the Sharee'ah is outmoded – intending thereby to defend their actions or those of their rulers.

many others. Hence, the Qutubists, rely upon the errors of our Scholars and their general statements in order to justify their beliefs and claims.

2. The statement of the Shaikh is in fact against the Qutubists, not for them, since he states that some people argue that for the preference of secular laws with the claim that the Sharee'ah is outdated and no longer relevant to our times. And this is disbelief!! It is the kufr of belief! It is but the very tafseel of the Salaf, that we are corroborating!

3. The issue revolves around the use of the incident with Abu Mijlaz in order to make it permissible to rule by secular laws and to defend the actions of the ruler(s) in this regard, and there is no one who uses these narrations to make istihlaal of ruling by the secular laws and nor to defend the crime of not ruling by what Allaah has revealed.

4. It is unfortunate that the Qutubists failed to make a distinction between the one who uses the narrations of Abu Mijlaz and Ibn Abbaas **in order to justify and make lawful ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed (Istihlaal)**, claiming that the Sharee'ah is outdated and between the one who uses the narrations of Abu Mijlaz in order to refute the Khawarij who would perform takfir of the rulers by their mere commission of what is a sin (that is kufr doona kufr) and in order to affirm that there is tafseel (clarification) in the matter.

As for those who forge a great lie against us and claim that we use the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas in order to make it permissible to rule by the secular laws or that we make it an excuse for the rulers of today to do so, or to defend them, or to "cement their thrones" then may Allaah hold the criminals to account. Rather, we say exactly as the two Shakirs say, in what we have quoted from them above. So the narrations from the two Shakir brothers do not support the Qutubists in any way in their attack and assault against Ahl us-Sunnah.⁵

Hence, the opponents have no real proof in order to negate the tafseel of the Salaf, but only rhetoric and logic. There are many more statements they use, but they are all similar and all have similar answers. They leave what is clear and unambiguous and then go and find ambiguous statements, in order to nullify the tafseel of the Salaf.

In summary, the issue of tashree' or taqneen (legislating) itself, comes under the tafseel of the Salaf, and this is clear – even in the words of those whom the Qutubiyyah quote from in order to justify their viewpoint – such as Imaam ash-Shanqeetee and the two Shakir brothers. So there is nothing in their favour, except sentiments, emotions and whims. The plot of the Qutubiyyah is to expel the issue of taqneen and tashree' from the framework of the tafseel of the Salaf, so that they can be left to make absolute, unrestricted takfir. To this end they utilise many statements, more than what we have covered here, in order to fool the people into believing that they are upon the truth.

⁵ There are also many other statements that are brought from the two Shakir's and they too are against the Harooriyyah, but this is not the place for a detailed treatment. In summary, though, they think that there exists in these statements what justifies their absolution and generalisation, when in fact, no such proof exists for them.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 18

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Www.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 24: What is the issue concerning at-Tahaakum

And amongst their doubts is that they say that if the reference point (for all judgements) is not the Sharee'ah and Sharee'ah alone, then the ruler, alongside his government, is apostate, and that anyone who refers to other laws, is a kaafir, without tafseel.

And this is replied to by Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, "And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of 'Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah' is by judging to his Shari'ah and confining oneself to that whilst rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allaah gave no authority. And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement **whilst believing in the correctness (sihhah) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that **without belief (I'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion." (Majmoo Fataawaa Ibn Ibraaheem 1/80).

And there is also the previous verdict of the Permanent Committee (signed by Imaam Ibn Baaz, and Shaikh Abdullaah bin Ghudayaan and Abdullaah bin Qu'ood) in response to the question, "...what is the ruling upon the one who refers judgement to (yatahaakama) the secular laws (al-qawaaneen al-wad'iyyah) while he knows of their futility, yet he does not fight against these laws and nor does he work to end these laws...?"

The reply of the Permanent Committee: "...Judging (at-Tahaakum) is to Allaah the Most High and to the Sunnah of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). So if he does not judge to them both (yatahaakam ilaihimaa), whilst making it lawful to judge to other than them (mustahillan it-Tahaakuma ilaa ghayrihimaa) amongst the secular laws (al-qawaaneen al-wad'iyyah) with the hope of deriving some material benefit or for the sake of

honour or for seeking a better position then he is one who is sinful (murtakibu ma'siyyatin) and is a sinner, faasiq, with the lesser fisq with does not expel him from Imaan...". (Refer to Fataawaa Lajnah ad-Daaimah of Shaikh Ahmad bin Abdur-Razzaq ad-Dawaish 1/540-541, Question 3 of Fatwaa No. 6310). Of course, this fatwaa is in relation of Istihlaal of action, not Istihlaal of belief.

However, when some makes tahaakum (referring judgement) to other than the judgement of Allaah, the kufr of such an act is not restricted to Istihlaal alone, or believing in its permissibility. Rather, when someone considers the law or judgement of other than Allaah to be great, or better, and the likes then this too is kufr. Hence, when someone makes tahaakum to other than the Sharee'ah, aggrandising this law and this judgement, thinking it to be great and so on, then this too is kufr. And in this, case whether one judged by it or not, makes no difference. However, due to the plausibility that such an act can occur by someone while believing in its unlawfulness, and believing that the Sharee'ah is better, but he does so due to dhulm, or fisq, then the act is not major kufr absolutely. Rather, it falls back upon the tafseel of the Salaf. And this is similar to the tafseel in obedience to the Mushriks, in that mere obedience in and of itself is not kufr – as will follow in the next question and answer.

So this argument of at-Tahaakum has no basis either, but as we shall see this doubt comes really from those who have been affected by Sayyid Qutb's extremist manhaj on these issues as we shall see later, in that they focus the issue not around the ruler any more but more on the existence of secular laws – in greater or lesser degrees – within the country in question, and in this manner, they are beguiled away from the tafseel of the Salaf in arriving at the judgement of takfir.

Finally, it is important to note that the aim of the Takfiriyyah, Qutubiyyah and others is to depart from the tafseel of the Salaf and tend to the absolution of the Khawaarij. To this end they have doubts that they use, based mainly on false reasoning and also by taking general, ambiguous statements of scholars and applying them or interpreting them in ways that cannot be reconciled with their other more explicit statements, or with what has been agreed upon by the 'Ulamaa.

As for all the ambiguous statements and generalised rulings they bring from the words of the Scholars, then they all fall back upon the tafseel of the Salaf, and this is clear, either in those statements themselves, or in other words of these Scholars which exist in their other works (and sometimes in the same works [and sometimes on the very same page!]).

Question 25: What about those who follow the [secular] laws and judgements of the Rulers? Does the tafseel of the Salaf apply to them as well?

The answer to this lies in what has been explained by Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah in "Kitaab ul-Imaan" (p.67), and this ought to be reflected upon carefully – so Shaikh ul-Islaam said, "And those who have taken their priests and rabbis as lords – when they obeyed them in their making lawful what Allaah had made unlawful, and making unlawful what Allaah had made lawful, then they are of two types: The first of them: that they know that they (the priests and rabbis) have made tabdeel (baddaloo) the religion of Allaah **and**

hence they follow them in this tabdeel believing (ya'taqidoona) in the lawfulness of what Allaah had made unlawful and in the unlawfulness of what Allaah had made lawful, following their leaders in that, alongside their knowledge that they have opposed the religion of the Messengers, then this is kufr (disbelief), and Allaah and His Messenger have also made it Shirk – even if they (the followers) do not prayer or prostrate to them. Hence, whoever followed someone else in something that opposes the religion **while knowing that it opposes the religion, and believes (i'taqada) in what he said, as opposed to what Allaah and His Messenger said, then such a one is a Mushrik, just like them.** And the second type: that their belief (i'tiqaad) and faith (imaan) in the lawfulness of what is lawful and the unlawfulness of what is unlawful is established, however, they follow them (the priests and rabbis) in disobedience to Allaah, just as a Muslim does when he commits a sin and believes that he is a sinner, so these ones have the same ruling as those like them from the people of sin.”

And the answer to this is clear, in that obedience to those who legislate laws, in and of itself, is not kufr and shirk unless it is accompanied with belief in the lawfulness of what Allaah made unlawful and vice versa, and belief in what the legislator (besides Allaah) has said. In other words, it like ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, has the same tafseel to it. This statement of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has also been quoted by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimin in his Majmoo' Fataawaa (2/144).

IMPORTANT NOTE: In the above quote from Shaikh ul-Islaam, note how he is speaking of the tabdeel that the priests and rabbis have fallen into, when they changed the judgements of Allaah, claiming they were something other than what they really were. This is actually different to those who rule by the secular laws – and who do not even claim that they are from Allaah, and from His Sharee'ah, but readily say, these are the laws of the British, the French, and so on. So if the tafseel that Shaikh ul-Islaam mentions applies to obedience to those who follow in the tabdeel, and believe it, then it also follows – even more so - in the case of those who obey those who rule by the secular laws.

And Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh, said, in criticism of the exaggerations of Sayyid Qutb, “And amongst [those matters] is that in the issue of obedience to the Mushrikeen, he did not understand the tafseel of the people of knowledge concerning it. So it is what is understood from his words is that which is in agreement with some of the Extremists (Ghullaat) on the issue of obedience (taa'ah), that is obedience to the Mushriks. Or obedience to the priests and rabbis (i.e. scholars). And from the examples of this is what he has mentioned in Surat ul-An'aam concerning the verse, “And if you were to obey them, you would be Mushriks”, so he says many things about this verse. And amongst them is the issue of the clothing of the fashion women and models, which are designed by the fashion agencies in Paris – using his (i.e Qutb's) expression. So he says that those who legislate for the women their clothing, such that in the morning they should wear such and such type of clothing, and in the evening this type of clothing and in the night this type of clothing, and at work this type of clothing and so on... Sayyid Qutb says, that his group of people, meaning the fashion designers, that they are gods (aalihah, plural of ilaah) because they have made the haraam to be halaal and so they are obeyed in that, and they made the halaal to be haraam, and so they are obeyed in that. So he (Qutb) says, that the Muslim

woman who obeys them in this has taken them as objects of worship (aalihah), because she has obeyed them in making lawful what is unlawful and making unlawful what is lawful. And there is no doubt that these words are baatil (false). Because when a woman wears forbidden clothes which have come from the direction of those designers, this does not at the same time mean she has believed that they are lawful (halaal) for her to wear. For the issue of takfir is in relation to the belief (I'tiqaad) that this thing that Allaah, the Majestic and Exalted, has made unlawful – is actually halaal... So for example, a woman who wears clothing that reveals her bosoms somewhat and her legs, in front of the foreign men, following the fashion designers in this, then if she believes that this act is haraam, yet she is overcome and her Imaan is weak, then this is not kufr and she has not worshipped them. So he (Qutb) has made mere obedience to be kufr, and some of the Jamaa'at have adopted this saying from him, those who have exaggerated in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, (they have taken from him) in the issue of obedience, that is obedience to the fashion designers and the promoters..."¹ (Cassette: Sharh Kitaab Masaa'il ul-Jaahiliyyah, 2nd cassette, 2nd side, and it is also in Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah of Isaam bin Sinaanee, being a compilation of the sayings of the scholars on the deviations of Sayyid Qutb.)

It is important to note here, that the neo-Qutubiyyah, like Safar al-Hawaali, Salman al-Awdah and others, actually took this aqeedah from Sayyid Qutb. Their aqeedah is the Kharijite aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb, and this is where they took it from, and when they made their takfir on account of sin, this is the same type of logic that they used!

Question 26: Could you explain more about the nature of Istihlaal?

Whoever ruled by other than what Allaah has revealed, whether he legislated it himself or whether it is the legislation of other than him, and claimed that it is permissible for him to do so (Istihlaal), or that what he is judging by is better, or is equal to Allaah's Sharee'ah, or that the corresponding Sharee'ah law is backward or barbaric and the likes, then such a one is a Kaafir, and he has contended with Allaah in his right of legislation – and has expressed that clearly and openly. This is the tafseel of the Salaf.

However, when a ruler merely passes a legislation – say for example, the allowance of usurious banks in the country – then this in and of itself is not a conclusive indicator that the ruler (or government for that matter) has passed this law due to its belief that ribaa' is lawful (from the Sharee'ah viewpoint), or due its belief that taking ribaa' is better and more superior than not taking ribaa' (from the point of view of the Sharee'ah). Since, it is plausible that ribaa' was allowed due to fisq, and due to seeking unlawful increase, or other matters. The fact that it is done in an institutionalised way, does not necessarily indicated Istihlaal. This is where the error of the neo-Kharijites lies, and where they have been deluded. A person may organise the building of a brothel, and then invite the people

¹ And by extension it is also clear that those who rule by the secular laws made up by the Kuffaar and Mushriks, then they are not to be declare Kuffaar merely on the act alone. Rather, when it becomes clear from them that they have made it lawful for themselves (i.e. in belief) claiming it is halaal for them, or when they state that these laws are better than the Sharee'ah or equal to it and the likes, then this is kufr. And in reality ALL of the statements of Ahl us-Sunnah on this topic, fall back upon this tafseel.

to it, for the sake of earning money, or for indulging in debauchery, but the organised way in which he has done it, does not actually indicate conclusively that he has made fornication and prostitution lawful, or that he considers it better than chastity and marriage (from the Sharee'ah viewpoint). Again, this is where the error of the neo-Kharijites lies. Similarly, brothels and prostitutes may be allowed to exist (in a country or a region) by the authority, and – refuge is from Allaah – they may even encourage all of this, but this again does not necessitate Istihlaal that expels from the religion.

Istihlaal is of two types – that of action and that of belief. And Istihlaal itself is actually I'tiqaad (i.e. it is something that is in the heart). Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, “And Istihlaal is I'tiqaad (belief in the heart), that that it is lawful for him, and this can occur sometimes due to holding the belief that Allaah has made it lawful [when He has not] and sometimes due to holding the belief that Allaah has not declared it unlawful, or sometimes due to not holding the belief that Allaah has actually made it unlawful.” (Saarim ul-Maslool 3/971).

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said, “Istihlaal is that a person believes that something that Allaah has made unlawful is lawful. As for Istihlaal of action, then we need to observe: If this Istihlaal (is related to something) that expels from the religion then a person becomes a disbeliever and apostate by it. So for example, if a person worked with usury (i.e. took or gave usury) without believing in its lawfulness, yet he persists in working with it, then such a one does not become a disbeliever because he did not declare it to be lawful. However, if he said, “Usury is lawful” and he intends by this the usury that Allaah has declared unlawful, then he becomes a disbeliever, since he is a denier (mukaddhib) of Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). So in this circumstance, Istihlaal would be that of action and also that of belief, with his heart. However, the Istihlaal in action, we need to look at the action itself, is it something which in and of itself, expels from the religion or not? And it is known that consuming interest does not make a person a disbeliever, rather it is one of the major sins. However, if a person prostrated to an idol, then he becomes a disbeliever. Why? Because this act itself expels from the religion. This is the principle, however it is necessary for us to observe another condition, and this is [to ensure] that the person who made something lawful (by istihlaal) is not excused due to ignorance, for if he is excused due to ignorance, then he does not become a disbeliever.” (Liqaa Baab al-Maftooh no. 1200)

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzan was asked, “Is the one who beautifies evil and lewd acts (faahishah) to the people to be declared a disbeliever? He replied, “Only those who call to kufr, disbelief, are to be declared disbelievers. As for when they call people to sins which do not reach the level of kufr, or shirk, then they are not to be declared disbelievers, however they are sinful on account of this. He (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, “Whoever called to guidance will have the reward of all of those who followed him without there being any decrease in the reward of those who followed him. And whoever calls to misguidance will carry the sin of all those who followed him in that, without there being any decrease in the sin of those who followed him.” [Muslim (2674), Abu Dawud (4609)] (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah)

The error of the neo-Kharijites lies in their taking the open commission of sin, and the organised (or institutionalised) form of committing sin (whether that be taking usury, or fornication or drinking alcohol and wine and the likes) to be indicative of Istihlaal, absolutely.

Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri explains, “And also from their principles [i.e. of the Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah] that they have established is that they say every sin which is organised and arranged (in a systematic manner) is actually kufr. And perhaps this also enters into what has preceded, in that it either relates to Istihlaal (as they see it) or other than that (from what has preceded). Why is it kufr (in their view)? Organised, arranged sin is kufr, why? They say that when you open a bank from the banks of ribaa’ (usury) – and we say ribaa’ is haraam (unlawful) but it is not kufr – however, when you set up certain regulations (qawaaneen) concerning the issues of employment, and responsibilities, that the day starts at such and such a time, and ends at such and such a time – so they say that all of this indicates that such a person (who arranges all of this) is Mustahill (has made it lawful as a matter of belief). Subhaanallaah! In that case, it is as if these people wish to say that something is not sin unless it occurs chaotically, randomly, and as for organised sin, then it is nothing but kufr! ... We say to you, in that case what is the benefit in your saying that “we affirm the tafseel (of the Salaf) in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, but we do not affirm the tafseel in the issue of tashree’ (legislation)”?.” (Cassette: The Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine).



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 19

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Www.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 27: What about the takfir of the Tartars and Genghis Khan

The answer to this has been covered in detail in MNJ050018 so refer to it, and it falls back upon the misunderstanding of the Qutubiyyah [Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah] of “tabdeel” and of the true reality of the nature of Genghis Khan, and of the Tartars and of their kufr. Genghis Khan was an original Kaafir, he was not even Muslim, and never was a Muslim. It is also important to note the reality of the Tartars and the reality of their religion. This will help to put into perspective, the statement of Ibn Katheer concerning their takfir:

- Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, “As the greatest of the Ministers (Spokesmen of the Tartars) to the Muslims – of ash-Shaam - said, while he is addressing the messengers of the Muslims and seeks to get closer to them by saying 'We are Muslims' and then says: **“These two great signs (aayataan adheemataa) came from Allaah, Muhammad and Genghis Khan.”** So this is what those who were sent forth (to the Muslims) used in order to get closer to the Muslims - by making the Messenger of Allaah and the most noble of creation and the chief of the sons of Aadam and the Seal of the Messengers - equal to a king who is a Kaafir, a Mushrik - one who is the greatest of the Mushriks in his disbelief, corruption, and enmity, such as Bukhtunassar and his likes”¹

- Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, “As for pure nifaaq (hypocrisy), then there is no doubt about the kufr of a person who has this. For he does not consider it to be obligatory to have tasdeeq (assent) in the Messenger (of Allaah) in what he informed (of revelation from Allaah), and nor does he consider it obligatory to obey him in that which he commanded – even though he may alongside this, believe that the Messenger is great and lofty in status, in knowledge and action, and that it is permissible to believe in him and obey him. Yet he says, “There is no harm in the differing religions,

¹ Majmoo' al-Fataawaa (28/521)

when the diety (that is worshipped) is the same one (in all of them)". And he considers that safety and happiness (in the Hereafter) can be attained by following the Messenger and not following the Messenger, either by following the ways of the Philosophers, or the Sabeans, by way of becoming a Christian or a Jew; which is the saying of the Philosophers and Sabeans in this particular issue and other issues. For even if they believe in him (the Messenger) and obey him, they do not actually believe in the obligation of that upon all of the inhabitants of the earth such that the one who abandons believing in him and obeying him will be punished. Rather, they consider the likes of this to be similar to adhering to the madhhab of a particular Imaam, or (following) a tareeqah ([Sufi] order) of a particular Shaikh or obedience to a King. **And this is the religion of the Tartars and whoever entered along with them.**" (Majmoo' al-Fataawaa7/639).

- He also said, "...And that is because the belief (I'tiqaad) of those Tartars in Genghis Khan was mighty indeed - for they used to believe that he was the Son of Allaah similarly to what the Christians believe regarding the Maseeh..."²
- And he continued, "...And they along with this (knowing that he is an illegitimate child, born of zinaa), make him the greatest of Messengers from Allaah in their adoration and aggrandisement of what he prescribed for them and legislated for them from his thoughts and desires- until some of them said regarding the wealth they had : 'This is the sustenance of Genghis Khan' and they would offer thanks to him for their food and drink, and they would make permissible the killing of the one who showed opposition to what this cursed kaafir prescribed for them - this opposer to Allaah, His Prophets and His believing slaves."³
- The statement of Imaam adh-Dhahabi concerning him, "He is the tyrant ruler of the Tartars, and also their very first king... they obeyed him in the manner the companions of a prophet would obey their prophet, in fact in same way that that the sincere servants would show obedience to the Lord of the Worlds... and he died upon their religion and their disbelief."⁴
- And adh-Dhahabee also said, "And he did not used to adhere to the religion of Islaam and nor to other than it, and killing a Muslim was more insignificant to him than killing a flea."⁵

After you have understood the reality of these people, who raised and aggrandised this kaafir (Genghis Khan) and his laws and his judgements, and who venerated them, and gave obedience to him in the manner that they did, such that his law become followed and obeyed and placed on a par, if not equal to that of Allaah and His Messenger, then you will

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Taarikh ul-Islaam (p.128)

⁵ Siyar (22/234) and in Taaj ul-'Aroos there occurs, that "he would not subscribe to any of the religions of the earth" (7/98)

easily understand the Ijmaa' upon their kufr. Take careful note of the saying of Ibn Katheer in the next quote, "so whoever amongst them does this... (faman fa'al dhalikha minhum)", meaning amongst the Tartars.

Ibn Katheer said concerning the tafseer of the verse "**Is it the rule of Jaahiliyyah they seek...**" so he said, "Allaah, the Most High, shows rejection against the one who departs from the overall comprehensive and decisive judgement of Allaah, which comprises all goodness, forbids from every evil, and turns (instead) to what is besides it of the opinions, desires and (customary) usages which men have placed, without any basis from the Sharee'ah of Allaah – similar to what the people of Jaahiliyyah used to judge by, of (laws of) misguidance and ignorance, and which they would devise based upon their own views and desires. Likewise, what the legislator judges by way of the political laws of governance taken from their king, Genghis Khan, who devised the Yaasiq for them. And this is a book that consists of a collection of laws that have been derived from many different legislations, Jewish, Christian, Islamic and others. And there are also many laws therein which he had taken by his mere opinion and desire. And thus it became a followed legislation amongst his offspring, who would put it above and before judgement by the Book and the Sunnah of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). Therefore, **whoever amongst them** does this is a Kaafir, it is obligatory to kill him, until he returns to the judgement of Allaah and His Messenger, and does not judge by anything other than it, in either small or great amounts." (Tafseer of 5:50)

So note the saying of Ibn Katheer "whoever amongst them does this"⁶, that is from amongst the Tartars who followed this legislation (of Genghis Khan), putting it above and before the legislation of Allaah – in the manner that they did. And this ruling is applicable to everyone who falls into what they fell into.

Hence, whoever amongst the Muslims (ruler or ruled) takes other than Allaah's Law, as a followed legislation, as a matter of principle, putting it over and above the judgement of Allaah, venerating and aggrandising it (in the manner that the Tartars did with the laws of Genghis Khan), obeying and referring this law with submission and humility, being pleased and satisfied with it in their hearts, considering it to be great and superior to, if not equal to, Allaah's law and so on, then there is no doubt about the kufr of such a one!! Ruler or ruled. This is why Qadafi, the Genghis of Libya, is an Apostate⁷. And likewise, anyone who followed (made ittibaa' of) the neo-Genghite Legislature of Qadhafi (the Ibn Genghis of the Era), in the manner that the Tartars followed the Yasiq of Genghis, venerating it, and placing it over and above the law of Allaah, believing in it, and agreeing to it, then there is no doubt about the kufr of such a one either. And all of this in perfect conformity with the tafseel of the Salaf, in that the takfir of an individual is carried upon this tafseel, such that it is being pleased and satisfied with these laws, considering them to

⁶ Please note that this word "minhum (amongst them)" is often removed, even in some of the printed versions of this tafseer, and it is often omitted, when people quote it.

⁷ Because he has claimed and expressed his satisfaction with his own law above and over Allaah's law, venerating his own law considering it to be decisive and great and superior.

be great and decisive and permissible⁸, showing submission and humility to them, aggrandising and venerating them that necessitates takfir – and not just the mere act of referring to them, since it is plausible for that to occur for other reasons, which are not kufr, and which involve dhulm and fisq⁹. This is similar to the issue of obedience to the Mushriks – in which there is the tafseel which has already preceded earlier in this series in the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, and also Shaikh Salih al-Shaikh (concerning obedience to the Mushriks and Priests and Rabbis), which is that mere obedience in itself is not Shirk and Kufr.

In reality, there is no proof for the Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah in any of this, and there is no proof for them in fleeing from the tafseel of the Salaf in the likes of these affairs and in passing the judgement of takfir over the rulers or the ruled. And the issue of the Tartars has been used by them to justify unrestricted takfeer, without tafseel. And nor is there in the takfir of the Tartars what they presume and imagine of the justification for unrestricted takfir of those who rule by some of the secular laws in the current times, and their bid to revive the way of the Khawaarij in using the apparent meanings of the verses to justify takfir of the Rulers in absolute terms.

To really appreciate what has been mentioned here the forthcoming GRV070016.

AN IMPORTANT NOTE:

⁸ Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem said, “The laws (al-qawaaneen) are kufr, the belief (I’tiqaad) that they are permissible and are decisive (haakimah).” (Majmoo’ Fataawaa Ibn Ibraaheem 12/280).

Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi quotes some good words of Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan bin Mu’alla al-Luwaihiq who said in his book “al-Ghuluww Fid-Deen” (p.291) concerning the six types of kufr in belief mentioned by Shaikh Ibn Ibraheem in Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen, “That which is apparent, and Allaah knows best, is that he – rahimahullaah – mentioned the first four types with expressions that indicate that they are in conformity with the rules and principles of making takfir of a specific and known individual (muy’ayyan) from amongst the Rulers, and this is why he used words which are in reference to a specific person. So he said, “... **that he rejects (An yajhada)**” and also “... **that he believes (An ya’taqida)**”... And as for the last two types, then he has intended “takfir an-nau’ (takfir by way of type, or takfir of the action)” by them. For this reason (in these latter two cases) **he has made his words revolve around the actual action (fi’l) itself, not the doer (faa’il)**. And built upon this, it is necessary, in the case of making the takfir of a specific individual who has fallen into any of the last two types, **that reference is made to the principles contained in the first four types**”. (Refer to Saihatu Nadheer p.97).

And this is what is apparent when one brings all of these affairs, in that takfeer is upon the tafseel of the Salaf, and is not made absolutely, unrestrictedly.

⁹ The saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in his Fataawaa (1/80) dated 9/1/1385H – five years after Tahkim ul-Qawanin was published: “And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of ‘Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah’ is by judging to his Shari’ah and confining oneself to that whilst rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allaah gave no authority. And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement **whilst believing in the correctness (sihha) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that **without belief (I’tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion.”

If we were to carry the takfir of the Tartars, in an absolute manner, - based purely on the issue of judging by the Yaasiq of Genghis Khan, then this would necessitate the takfir of a large number of ordinary Muslims who judge to the secular laws in their disputes, whether related to social affairs, like marriage and so on, or affairs related to business or otherwise. And all of them judge to the secular, pagan laws – whether in the lands of the Non-Muslims themselves, or otherwise. So if we were to apply the words of Ibn Katheer, unrestrictedly, then that would make the judgement of takfir upon a large number of common-Muslims, who are actually ignorant.

There is nothing in the Takfir of the Tartars that indicates that the Takfir is “alal-itlaaq”, i.e. in absolute terms. Rather, we find that looking at the words of other scholars, there is what indicates that there is tafseel to the matter. Such as the saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem as has preceded.

Then there is the saying of the Allaamah, Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan Aal ash-Shaikh, “...and it is forbidden to pass judgement (tahkeem) when the judgement is based upon a false (baatil) Sharee’ah which opposes the Book and the Sunnah, **such as the laws of the Greeks (Ahkaam Yoonaan) and those of Europe, and those of the Tartars, and their various legislative codes (qawaaneen) the source of which are their own opinions and desires. Similar to this are the various cultural and customary practices of the Bedouins.** Hence, whoever made it lawful to judge (istahalla) by [any of] this in the issues pertaining to blood, or other than it is a Kaafir. Allaah the Most High said, “**And whosoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Unbelievers**” (5:44). And concerning this verse, some of the Mufasssiroon have said that the kufr intended here is the kufr that is lesser than the Major kufr (kufr doona kufr al-akbar), because they understood that this verse applies to whoever judges by other than what Allaah has revealed but does not make that lawful (ghayr mustahill). But they do not dispute amongst themselves regarding its application in general to the mustahill (one who makes it lawful), and that the kufr in this case is the one that expels from the religion.” (Minhaaj ut-Ta’sees, p.71).

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, “**There is no doubt that the one who does not believe (i’taqada) in the obligation to rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever. Hence, whoever declares it permissible (istahalla) to judge amongst the people with what he considers to be justice, without following what Allaah has revealed, then he is a disbeliever.** There is no nation except that it orders ruling with justice. And sometimes justice, as perceived by its senior leaders, can exist in its religion. Many of those who ascribe themselves to Islaam judge by their customs that Allaah has not revealed, such as the ancestral customs of the bedouins. And the chiefs (umaraa) were obeyed (in this) and **they used to consider that it is desirable to judge by these such customs, without the Book and the Sunnah. And this is disbelief.** For many people have accepted Islaam but along with this they do not judge except by their natural [inherited] customs, those that are ordered by those whom they obey. **So if they know (‘arafoo) that it is not permissible to judge except by what Allaah has revealed and did not adhere to that, but in fact declared it to be lawful (istahalloo) for themselves to judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, then they are disbelievers.**

And if not [i.e. did not declare it lawful for themselves] then they are [merely] ignorant people – as has preceded about them” Minhaaj us-Sunnah (5/130)

Hence, the takfir of individuals, is upon the tafseel of the Salaf, in that when a person judges to the secular laws, (whether the customs of the Bedouins, or the customs of the Tartars, or the modern secular laws), then tafseel is adhered to in that the person is not declared a kaafir, unless he makes it permissible, or considers the secular law to be better, or equal to Allaah’s Law and so on, or the one who praises and aggrandises the originator of these laws, thinking him and his law to be great and decisive and so on, just like the Tartars did with the Yaasiq of Ghengis.

As for using the takfir of the Tartars and Genghis Khan in particular, for analogising between this and the takfir of the Rulers today who rule by the secular laws, then refer to MNJ050018 for a detailed treatment of that.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 20

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 28: What is the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb concerning this matter and where does he stand with respect to the tafseel of the Salaf?

It is important to remember here the well-known principle that a man can have in him Imaan and Kufr (the minor kufr), and Tawheed and Shirk (the minor shirk), Ikhlâas and Nifaaq (minor nifaaq), Sunnah and Bid'ah, Taqwaa and Fujoor and so on – and alongside all of that he is a Muslim and Believer (to the extent of what he has with him of Tawheed, Imaan, Sunnah, Ikhlâas, Taqwaa and so on).

And the act of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed (as has preceded above) is from the minor kufr, and only becomes major kufr in certain situations and conditions. It is for this reason we see the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and his associates (and the whole of the Ummah) thereafter, of the verses related to rulership in al-Maa'idah, explaining them to be in reference to the minor kufr. And so the presence of this minor kufr does not negate the basis of Imaan. This is what Ibn al-Qayyim referred to as the "Tafseel of the Sahaabah" (in his Kitaab us-Salaat, as has preceded), and Shaikh ul-Islaam, in his book Kitaab ul-Imaan also explains this point by quoting the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and his associates on numerous occasions. Hence, a believer could have a mixture of Imaan and Kufr (minor kufr).

The aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb necessitates that in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, there is only Imaan **OR** Kufr, and no in-between state. This is based upon his extremist exaggeration of the meaning of the kalimah, that it is essentially haakimiyyah – that is that the Kalimah means Allaah is the only true judge and lawmaker. This extremism led him to the "All or Nothing" syndrome which his writings are replete with. And this "All or Nothing" syndrome was applied to both those who rule and those who are ruled over. And the end result of this type of absolution is the madhhab of the Khawaarij.

Stated the sayyid of the Qutubists, “Certainly, the [underlying] issue in all of this is the issue of [either] Imaan or kufr, Islaam or Jaahiliyyah, and the legislation or the desire. **And certainly there is no in-between state in this affair**. There is no truce or any treaty (in this affair)! The believers are those who judge by what Allaah has revealed – they do not distort a single letter from it, and nor do they replace any of it whatsoever. And the disbelievers, the oppressors and sinners, they are the ones who do not judge by what Allaah has revealed. Either the rulers are upholding the Sharee’ah **in its complete entirety (kaamilatan)**, and hence they are within the confines of Imaan, or they are upholding other legislations, those for which Allaah has not given any authority. Hence, they are disbelievers, oppressors, and sinners. And either the people [those ruled over] accept the law and decision of Allaah from the rulers and judges in their affairs, so that they are believers ... and if not then they are not believers. **And there is no middle path between this path or that path, and nor is there any evidence and nor is there any excuse (ma’dhirah)** and nor any seeking to use the excuse of an attainable benefit (maslaha)...” (az-Zilaal 2/887-888)

He also stated, completing his thought and ideology, “Certainly, the one who obeys a person in regard to a legislation that he has [devised] himself, even if it was in a very minute matter (juz’iyyah sagheerah), then he is a pagan (Mushrik). And if he was a Muslim originally and then did this (obeyed someone in other than the Sharee’ah), then he has left Islaam and entered into Shirk as well... regardless of whether he continues to repeat “Laa ilaaha illallaaha” with this tongue after that – the while he takes from other than Allaah and obeys other than Allaah.” (az-Zilaal 3/1198).

He also says: “The time has reverted back to its original form on the very day this religion can to mankind with the phrase “Laa ilaaha illallaaha”. For mankind has apostatised and gone to the worship of the servants, and to the oppression of the various religions and it has fled from “Laa ilaaha illallaaha”. [This is so] even though a party from amongst them repeat “Laa ilaaha illallaaha” from the minarets, without understanding its meaning and without intending this particular meaning when they repeat it, and without rejecting the Sharee’ah of al-Haakimiyyah that the servants have claimed for themselves.” (az-Zilaal 2/1057)

These types of themes are abundant in Sayyid Qutb’s works, especially Milestones (Ma’aalim Fit-Tareeq) and also his Tafsir (Fee Dhilaal il-Qur’aan). The essence of the matter is that Sayyid Qutb entered extremism into this particular issue, which over the decades would lead to the gradual erosion of the tafseel of the Salaf – as the Qutubi, Ikhwaani, Takfiri da’wah made inroads into Ahl us-Sunnah – and the gradual inception of the absolution and generalisation of Sayyid Qutb. At his time and after his death Sayyid Qutb was actually refuted by a lot of the scholars of Egypt for his extremism and Ikhwanite figureheads also noted his extremism thereafter.

Fareed Abdul-Khaliq (one of the former Murshids of Ikhwaan): “We have pointed out in what has preceded that the spread of the ideology of takfir occurred amongst the youth of the Ikhwaan who were imprisoned in the late fifties and early sixties, **and that they**

were influenced by the ideology of the Shaheed¹ Sayyid Qutb and his writings. They derived from these writings that the society had fallen into Jahiliyyah (of kufr), and that he had performed takfir of the rulers who had rejected the Hakimiyyah of Allaah by not ruling by what Allaah has revealed, and also takfir of those ruled over (i.e. civilians), when they became satisfied with this.” (Ikhwan ul-Muslimoon Fee Mizanil-Haqq’ p.115)

Pay very close attention to the following:

Sayyid Qutb stated in az-Zilaal (3/1492), “As for those idols about which it is known that they (the pagans) used to worship, then never was their worship of them built upon the belief that those idols had (the right of) Uloohiyyah, like the Uloohiyyah of Allaah – free is he of imperfection. And the Noble Qur’an has explained the reality of their ideological belief regarding these idols and their reason for giving devotion to them in His saying, the Most High, “And those who take Auliya’ (protectors and helpers) besides Him (say): ‘We worship them only that they may bring us near to Allâh.’” (Zumar 39:3). So this was the extent of their belief and understanding with respect to these idols, that they were merely intercessors with Allaah. **And the reality of their Shirk was not from this angle.(!!!)** The Islaam of those who submitted (and became Muslim) was not exemplified by their mere abandonment of seeking these idols as intercessors, and if not then the Hunafaa who refrained from worshipping the idols and made their devotion for Allaah alone would be considered Muslims.(!!) Islam is exemplified with belief (i’tiqad) and devotion (to Allaah) **and singling out Allaah – free from imperfection – with al-Haakimiyyah, in every era and place.** They are mushriks and their mere belief that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah and their mere devotion to Him alone (with the acts of ritual worship) **would not be sufficient to remove them from this Shirk**, for in this case they would merely be like the Hunafaa whom no one considered to be Muslims. **People are only considered Muslims when they complete the rings of the chain**, meaning when they add to their belief (in the kalimah) and their devoting the acts of worship to Allaah alone, **the singling out of Allaah – free is He from imperfection – with al-Haakimiyyah**, and their rejection of any legislation, or law, or rule, or principle, or following (taqleed) which did not come from Allaah alone. **This alone is Islaam because this alone is the true meaning of the testimony that “there is none that has the right to be worshipped except Allaah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah”...**”

What he is stating here that testifying that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah and acting upon the pillars (i.e. the ritual acts of worship etc.) is not sufficient for true and correct (i.e. valid) Islaam. Rather, only when al-Haakimiyyah (as Sayyid Qutb understands it) is added to that is a person considered to be a Muslim. Otherwise, he is nothing short of a Mushrik. And of course al-Haakimiyyah, to Sayyid Qutb, is that a ruler rules by all of what Allaah has revealed, and that any shortcoming in this regard is Shirk with Allaah in his Uloohiyyah.

¹ Stating “Shaheed” unrestrictedly is not permissible and is indicative of Irjaa’.

So this type of understanding led to absolution (itlaaq) and generalisation and a departure from the tafseel of the Salaf. It also affected and influenced people in different ways. To those who were nurtured upon the books of Sayyid Qutb – while ignorant of the Salafi aqeedah and manhaj, never having been introduced to it – they thought that the absolutions and generalisations of Sayyid Qutb were the actual truth and that this was the madhhab of Ahl us-Sunnah. In later times, in the 70s and 80s when the Ikhwan in general (who were upon the thought of Sayyid Qutb in the field of takfir and haakimiyyah) had more exposure to the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah, and came to realise the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard, they then introduced shubuhaat (similar to those that were covered earlier) and found many generalised and ambiguous statements to support these shubuhaat, statements from the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah. They also attempted to explain away and discredit the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas, which the whole Ummah had taken with acceptance. In reality, the contention surrounding the concept of “the lesser kufr” (kufr doona kufr) came from the direction of Ikhwaan, chief amongst them Mohammad Qutb, who labelled this explanation as “madhloom Ibn 'Abbaas” – what exactly he meant by this, then Allaah knows best.

As for those who were actually upon the tafseel of the Salaf but then got poisoned by the teachings of Sayyid Qutb and Mohammad Qutb, then they shifted towards the absolution (itlaaq) of Sayyid Qutb. This saw their subsequent attachment to some of the statements of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and also the two Shakir brothers on this issue. They then drew upon many of the ambiguous and general words of the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah in this regard, and used them in order to centre their discussions around the topics of tabdeel and istibdaal and the likes and to then claim an Ijmaa' on the kufr of the one “replaces” the Sharee'ah, without actually clarifying what they actually mean, or what is actually meant by tabdeel, istibdaal and the likes. Because the likes of these people were Salafi in their background, this caused a lot of confusion for others, because they drew upon the ambiguous words of the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah, in order to express their new found orientation in manhaj, which was in reality, the extremism of Sayyid Qutb in Haakimiyyah.

This phenomena was clearly observed by the attachment of these people to some of the statements of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, and also Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen (who actually had many other statements which clarified his general statements) and others. People who got affected in this manner included the neo-Qutubiyyah of Saudi Arabia, like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah, Nasir al-'Umar and others who were poisoned by Mohammad Qutb. And similarly those in the west who got poisoned by these ones include the likes of Ali at-Timimi, who prior to 1995 would clearly state the tafseel of the Salaf and apply it to the rulers who judge by the secular laws of the British and French, and would never talk of the tabdeel and istibdaal and the great ambiguities surrounding these affairs (refer to MNJ050018, GRV070016 for more details), and then lo and behold, after 1997, he then came out with all of these shubuhaat and then began speaking of the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb on al-Haakimiyyah and also he began speaking of the same shubuhaat that we have covered in earlier questions.

In addition many of those who were originally outright Takfiri and Khariji and only held their views on this topic based upon what they had learnt from the Ikhwanite figureheads like Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and Abdullaah Azzaam and others - they then found new support for their views, when they came to learn of the statements of the likes of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, Imaam ash-Shanqeetee and Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Ibn Baaz, all of which were either ambiguous and general and clarified elsewhere with tafseel, or were in relation to total istibdaal. So they jumped upon these statements and the shubuhaat that were built upon them, and then utilised them to make takfeer of the rulers who judge by the secular laws (in greater or lesser amounts), without tafseel. And in their great ignorance of the true state of affairs and the realities in this issue, they thought that they were upon manifest guidance.

Prior to the entrance of this fitnah, the issue of replacement of the Sharee'ah was not really a point of dispute, despite the fact that the sayings of the Scholars were in existence. However, when the Qutubiyyah made their open da'wah – which was a well-defined da'wah, being taken from the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb and Hasan al-Bannaa, and because some of those who called to this da'wah had been nurtured in a Sunni environment (i.e. Hawali, Awdah etc.) they then gathered and compiled the statements of those scholars which would support their manhaj in general. Notice we say, “support their manhaj in general” and not “support their particular viewpoint (on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed”. This is because although the views of some of our scholars gave support to their viewpoint on a particular matter, the manhaj of our scholars was altogether different to the actual manhaj that these Qutubiyyah were upon, and which they sought to promote by scavenging upon the words of our scholars². So the issue was not

² BETWEEN THE QUTUBIYYAH AND THE SHAIKHS OF AD-DA'WAH AS-SALAFIYYAH

The First Position

There are those who hold the view that judging by the secular laws, in place of the Sharee'ah laws in the majority of matters is major kufr – and at the same time, they refute Sayyid Qutb and his heresies and declare him a Jaahil who uttered kufr and apostasy. They enjoin obedience to the Rulers, declare Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah to be an innovation and misguidance, and warn from takfir of rulers and nation states, warn against open rejection upon the pulpits, and also refute those who deviate in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and who are upon the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa. Indeed this is the likes of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others.

The Second Position

Then there are those who hold the view that judging by the secular laws, in place of the Sharee'ah laws in the majority of matters is not major kufr absolutely and is to be carried upon the tafseel of the Salaf – and at the same time, they refute Sayyid Qutb and his heresies and declare him a Jaahil who uttered kufr and apostasy. They enjoin obedience to the Rulers, declare Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah to be an innovation and misguidance, and warn from takfir of rulers and nation states, warn against open rejection upon the pulpits, and also refute those who deviate in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and who are upon the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa. Indeed this is the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al'Abbaad, then those who follow their view, such as al-'Anbari and al-Halabi and others.

And so they differ with each other, on this one issue (of the ruling on judging by the secular laws in place of the Sharee'ah), while being united upon the rest.

The Third Well-Defined Orientation

just “an academic discussion of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed” and who is right or who is wrong. Rather, it extended to much more than that and entered into the fields of the manhaj of da’wah, rectification of the Muslim societies, issues related to takfir and khurooj, and all of the other many issues that we have outlined elsewhere.

This is why, as we mentioned earlier, that the da’wah of the neo-Qutubiyyah, in recent times, during the Gulf War and after it, allowed the outright Khawaarij and Takfiris to enter into the da’wah of Ahl us-Sunnah and to cause great confusion amongst their ranks – whereas previously, their situation was very clear to Ahl us-Sunnah.

Then there are the Charlatans, Biased Partisans, neo-Qutubites, born of the Awakening of Qutubism and who upon the manhaj of those declared “The Khawaarij of the Era” by Imaam al-Albaani who monopolise upon this difference between OUR scholars, while they praise and aggrandise the Innovators, declaring them “Shaheeds” and “Imaams of Guidance”, and who make Takfir ‘alal-Itlaaq, secretly promote the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna, who have deviated in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, innovated into the matter of Tawheed, innovated Shurocracy, adopted the methods of the Infidels in their da’wah (revolutions, open demonstrations, rallies), and made the focus of da’wah to be shifted from what the Prophets were upon to field and arena of the Kharijites – of takfir and haakimiyyah and khurooj. They remain silent upon the Innovators, make walaa and baraa for their sake, while showing the greatest of enmity towards the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah, and striving the utmost to accuse them with the Irjaa of Jahm Ibn Safwaan.

These Neo-Qutubites (like Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and others), adopted the madhhab of Sayyid Qutb, and then called to it, nurtured the youth upon it, and then removed the fine line that used to exist between the Salafis and the outright Khawaarij and Takfiris. So these Takfiris and Khawaarij entered into the da’wah, and then, whereas before they would make takfir ‘alal-itlaaq based upon a nullification of the tafseer of Ibn ‘Abbaas and speak with the apparent and absolute meanings of the verses in al-Maa’idah and an-Nisaa’ – just like the Khawaarij of old, they then began to play upon the concepts of tabdeel, istibdaal, tashree’ etc. to further support their manhaj – using some of the words of OUR scholars for that.

We see them, and we know them, and their signs, and their distinguishing characteristics, and their hijacking of the da’wah!

And if they really wish to truly make Allaah’s word supreme, then let them free themselves from the Raafidee Heretics, and the Soofee Innovators, around whose beliefs and teachings, their whole manhaj of Extremist Takfir and Haakimiyyah and Irjaa’ towards the Innovators is based!!



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 21

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 29: Where does this aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb lead to or what are its influences

Revisiting this da'wah, which is based primarily on an extremist and exaggerated interpretation of the Kalimah, and the claim that its meaning is embodied in al-Haakimiyyah, that is Allaah is only Lawmaker, then any departure from ruling by Allaah's Law in its entirety, constitutes Shirk. Built upon that, the societies in existence today are all apostate, and in reality there has been no true Islamic society in existence for hundreds of years. Therefore, since the nature of the current societies is such that it is representative of the pre-Islamic Jaahiliyyah, the way to re-establishing Allaah's Law is by vacating and departing from the society ('Uzlah), and breaking off from it. Then re-building and preparing, ready for the cataclysmic confrontation, with the "Fir'aunic leaders", who have assumed for themselves the position of godhead in legislating. And this was the "Jihaad" that was envisioned by Qutb.

Terms used in Qutb's conceptualisation included, Haakimiyyah, 'Uzlah (the breaking off), Ummah al-Ghaa'ibah (the absent Ummah), Jaahiliyyah and many others.

The Qutubi Model is fundamentally flawed, in that it attributes all evil and oppression and injustice to the "leaders" who have "assumed godhead", and hence a "top-down" approach is inevitable. The model as a whole contains an intrinsic rejection of the way in which Allaah operates in His creation, and also the way in which true rectification is achieved. This naturally creates an imbalance in the orientations of da'wah, leading to much confusion and strife, and also excessive bloodshed, when the blue-print programme of Qutb is carried out, or initiated. Though Qutb himself never lived to see the programme in action, it was acted upon by a number of different individuals and also organised groups in various places – all of them failing. This occurred numerous times in Egypt, all of which failed. Two notable examples are those of Shukri Mustapha and Faraj. The former

adopted the 'Uzlah (the breaking off) approach and along with some other followers broke off from the society and went off on the outskirts of Cairo, in order to prepare for the cataclysmic confrontation. However, this was obviously not to succeed and the authorities soon clamped down upon them and terminated them. Another approach was one that went straight for the overall despot – thinking that once the “Fir’aun” has been terminated, the rest of the populace will join in with the overall revolt. And this was exemplified in the assassination of Sadat, which was planned by Faraj. Again, this bore no fruits and only tightened the grip that the authorities would have upon the populace in general. Also in Hamaa in Syria, where the Ikhwanites initiated a revolution which again failed and led to great calamities. And similarly, the same was attempted by the Qutubiyyah in Saudi Arabia in recent times, though the plot did not go beyond the doctrinal stage – since the perpetrators were exposed and restrained.

It is worthy to make mention that the Qutubites in Arabia were quite openly preaching Qutubism and entering the books of bid'ah and zandaqah upon the youth. This did not really come to the attention of the major scholars until after the Gulf War, when their true colours were revealed. It was revealed that the same concepts of Qutb, those of Jaahiliyyah, Haakimiyyah, that kufr had engulfed the whole society, that open rejection should be justified, lectures and books which spoke of the concept of Uzlah, and also al-Ummah al-Ghaa'ibah (the Absent Ummah, which of course is the same as the takfir of Qutb of contemporary Muslim societies) and other related issues. These concepts were being propounded by the Qutubites to the youth. However, this programme never really got past the doctrinal stage, though in later years, its effects would become apparent when some of the Saudi youth, frustrated, took to terrorist activities, and also many of the youth began to belittle and defame the Salafi Mashaayikh, claiming they were “pawns” and “puppets”.

Question 30: What is the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb in general?

To avoid going into detail, as this has been done elsewhere, Sayyid Qutb, was an apostate for over 11 years (in his Communist years), and also spent a long time in the United States, where he would travel from Nevada to Colorado, working in the Churches, and taking part in ringing the bells, as a member of the committees that are responsible for the maintenance of the churches. Anyhow, after this period he returned back to Egypt and then became an Islamic writer, having zeal for Islaam once more. All of this is from his own words in his autobiography.

The reality was that he was Jaahil (ignorant). The sum total of his books reveal that he spoke of almost every innovation in history, and fell into kufr and apostasy. Amongst the most salient features of his aqeedah and manhaj:

- a) propounding the manhaj of the Khawaarij of takfir and khurooj, and raising the flag of Dhul-Khuwaisarah of “al-Haakimiyyah” and “Social Justice”
- b) uttering statements of kufr and apostasy such as his mockery of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam)
- c) his claim that parts of the Islamic sharee'ah should be abolished as they no longer suit the times (i.e. slavery and the laws pertaining to it)

- d) his claim that Islaam is a mixture of Christianity and Communism, sharing in their ideals
- e) his accusing Mu'aawiyah and Amr ibn al-Aas of nifaaq (hypocrisy), deception (ghish), treachery (khiyaanah) and other affairs
- f) his belittlement and disdain and rebuke of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and accusing him of senility, and misappropriating the funds of the bait ul-maal, and favouritism, and his refusal to acknowledgement of Uthmaan's khilaafah
- g) his takfir of Banu Umayyah
- h) speaking with the creation of the Qur'aan, the saying of the Jahmiyyah
- i) rejection of al-Istiwaah, in the way and style of the Ash'ariyyah
- j) his rejection of Ahaad Hadeeth in the matters of aqeedah, the saying of the Mu'tazilah
- k) his rejection of the miracles of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)
- l) his speaking of the freedom of people to choose any religion and that Islaam fights for this right
- m) his takfir of all muslim societies
- n) his speaking with the Qur'aan and interpreting it with mere opinion and ignorance
- o) his saying that Imaan is a single entity which does not separate and consist of divisions, which is the point of origin for the innovations of the Khawaarij and Murji'ah

This is only by way of a small selection. For more information one can refer to the excellent refutations of Sayyid Qutb by Abdullaah ad-Duwaish, Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee and others, who have excelled in this field and whose efforts have been praised and commended by the likes of Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen and many others.

In short, the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb cannot even be defined!! But it is based upon Jahl and Hawaa and Dalaalah.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 22

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 31: Who are the ones who subscribe to Sayyid Qutb, or have been affected by his teachings and what is the basis of their ascription to him?

The first and most important point to note is that the basis of ascription of anyone to Sayyid Qutb, can never be on the basis of Aqeedah. It is inconceivable that any Salafi, that is a true Salafi, can subscribe to Sayyid Qutb, and raise and aggrandise him, because of his belief that Sayyid Qutb is a Salafi, a hardcore Athari, upon the aqeedah of Imaam Ahmad, Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab. It is impossible for any Salafi to subscribe to him on this basis, and even a Salafi with the most basic knowledge of his aqeedah and manhaj knows this.

This then shows that all of those who subscribe to him, and his manhaj, and defend him and promote him and his books and nurture the youth upon these books and claim that they are the best of what has been written on Tarbiyyah and the likes, then it illustrates one of three things:

- a) Their total, complete, compound, utter ignorance of the Salafi aqeedah by failing to note the great calamities in Qutb's books, some which reach the level of kufr and apostasy – in which case it can hardly be said that they are Salafi in aqeedah, let alone anything else
- b) Their full knowledge of the Salafi aqeedah coupled with their total ignorance of the calamities in Qutb's books, the very ones they promote – and so this illustrates their jahl, weak perception, lack of scholarly knowledge and inability to defend or even know truth from falsehood. Hence, they are worst of all people in having roles of leadership or involvement in da'wah
- c) Their full knowledge of the Salafi aqeedah and also their full knowledge of Qutb's calamities, and his statements of kufr and apostasy and his Rafidite notions and

his speaking of the greatest of innovation – but they have an agenda and a goal, which can be realised and actualised by the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb

We leave the reader to make their own decision.

The most famous Qutubis today are the following:

Hamoud bin Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee: He is one of the most senior of the Qutubi Intelligentsia today, and is also one of Salman al-Awdah's teachers. He openly proclaims his adherence to the manhaj of Qutb, and his excessive praise and aggrandisement of this Rafidee Heretic, and his promotion of his manhaj. A sign of a hizbee is that he will quote and make reference to this individual. He accuses anyone who speaks against Sayyid Qutb and who refutes him, to have ulterior motives, and says that they have difference goals and objectives but all share the same benefits that arise for them in refuting Sayyid Qutb(!!!). In short, ash-Shu'aybee is a Hardcore Qutubi, and the beliefs and orientations of ash-Shu'aybee necessitate that the Salafi Ulamaa, such as Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani and others are hardcore Murji'ah, from the school of thought of Jahm Ibn Safwaan.

Salman al-Awdah: Another hardcore Qutubi, unabashed in his declaration of Sayyid Qutb as an "Imaam of Guidance". So he said, "That which I worship Allaah with is that the teacher, **Sayyid Qutb is from the Imaams of Guidance and Religion, from amongst the Callers of Rectification and one of the Carriers of the Islamic Thought (Fikr). He used his thought and his pen to defend Islaam, explain its meanings and to repel the doubts of its enemies, to establish and affirm its beliefs (aqaa'id) and rulings (ahkaam) in a manner that very few people in these times have embarked upon...**"(!!!) (The View of Salman al-Awdah on Sayyid Qutb, written and released 22/6/1421H). How deep is the ignorance (or the feigning of ignorance) of Salmaan of the one whom he praises."

We wonder which aqidah did Sayyid Qutb explain and defend? The aqidah of the Rafidah, the Jahmiyyah, the Ash'ariyyah, the Soofiyyah, the Mu'tazilah?! Or the Salafi Aqidah?! Indeed, the only reason for the attachment of these newly-arisen ones to Sayyid Qutb and his books and his manhaj is because of what they are upon of Revolutionary Takfirism, for their saying is the same as the saying of the Khawaarij of old who exaggerate in the affair of takfir – leading them to takfir of the sinners, as occurred with Salman al-Awdah.

Safar al-Hawaali: Another hardcore Qutubi figurehead. In his doctrinal farce, "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa"¹, one of a series of farces that illustrated his departure from the dictates of Sunnah and Salafiyyah, quotes Sayyid Qutb on numerous occasions (at one point he quotes a full 10 pages verbatim from Sayyid Qutb). He also equates him with Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab, when he says, "Indeed those are few, those who when they call to the correction of Imaan and the

¹ And an excellent refutation of this farce will soon be presented, being based upon the refutation of Imaam al-Albaani of this book, who described it as "the extremity in evil" and who also said about its author, "I did not believe that its author would reach this level". Refer to "Fitnat ul-Asr" (2 Cassettes) and also "Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah" and refer also to the lecture of Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi in Birmingham 29th July 2000.

exposition of its meanings and explain kufr and its manifestations to the Ummah, and its great danger. **We find that in turn, the Ummah stands in their faces and accuses them of making takfir of the Muslims, as occurred with Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and the Shaheed, Sayyid Qutb**". (Dhaahirah p.83). And using the word Shaheed for someone without making the exception (istithnaa) is from repugnant Irjaa (!!)

Subhaanallaah. No comment is needed here, but anyone with a bit of knowledge and sense will see the great deceit and treachery inherent in these words.

Safar al-Hawali quotes verbatim what has actually been said by Sayyid Qutb: – "What is the core issue on account of which the Prophets, Martyrs and the Righteous fought for?" and he continues a page later, **"...If the reality of worship had been but the mere rituals of devotion**, then none of this would have deserved the sending of a convoy of Messengers and Messages. The Tawheed of Uloohiyyah, the Tawheed of Ruboobiyyah, the Tawheed of Qawaamah, the Tawheed of al-Haakimiyyah, the Tawheed of the source of the Sharee'ah, the Tawheed of the methodology of life, the Tawheed of direction by which the people conduct their worldly life completely ... this is the Tawheed that is deserving of all the Messengers to be sent (for its sake).!!" (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa pp. 94-96).

Note that the last five types of Tawheed that are mentioned are in fact all Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah, and Tawheed al-Asma was-Sifaat has not even been mentioned!!

As for the Tawheed of Uloohiyyah, then that is but the rituals of devotion. And as for Ruboobiyyah then that is not differed about. So to Sayyid Qutb and Safar al-Hawali (and also to Mohammad Suroor and Mohammad Qutb), the actual call of the Messengers was to al-Haakimiyyah. It should come as no surprise that the actual supervisor of this work of al-Hawaali was none other than Mohammad Qutb, the one who said, "The meaning of Laa ilaaha ilallaaha is 'There is no deity but Allaah, there is no Haakim (ruler) but Allaah'". (Hawla Tatbeeq ash-Sharee'ah pp.20-21). He also stated, **"Certainly, the matter requires that the people be called afresh to Islaam**. Not so because they – in this time – refuse to say with their mouths, 'Laa ilaaha ilallaaha Muhammad Rasoolullaah', as the people use to refuse to say it in the very first strangeness [i.e. the call of the Prophet Muhammad]. **But [more so] because they – in this time – reject the principle requirement of 'Laa ilaaha illallaaha' and that is judging to the Shari'ah of Allaah"** (Waqi'una al-Mu'asir p.29).

Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid: He is also one of the Kibaar of the Qutubiyyah. He stated, "Reading the books of those who have passed before us has established a strong attachment in our souls for this religion, because they write from a position of strength and superiority. And for this reason we also encourage the people to read the modern books, those which are written by the Muslim with the spirit of superiority, such as the books of Sayyid Qutb (rahimahullaah)". (Cassette: K aifa Taqra'a Kitaaban).

And he also says in his book "Nasihah Li Islaah al-Buyoot" (p.23), "And here, my brother, reader, are some suggestions in this regard: In Tafseer... "Fee Dhilaal il-Qur'aan" of Sayyid

Qutb.” And he also said on (p.24), “Just like there are a number of good books on a variety of different issues, amongst them the books of the Teacher, Sayyid Qutb (rahimahullaah), such as “Al-Mustaqbal Lihaadha ad-Deen”, “Haadha ad-Deen”, “Ma’aalim Fit-Tareeq (Milestones)”, “Khasaa’is at-Tasawwur al-Islaami...”.

Muhammad Sa’eed al-Qahtanee: He is also one of the prominent Qutubiyyah and says in “al-Walaa wal-Baraa” (p215), “And some of the Noble Scholars from the scholars of the Muslims have written on this subject with that which heals and is sufficient...” and then he adds in the footnote to this, “I make mention of some of them, Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, Allaamah Ibn al-Qayyim, Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and his students, and from the contemporaries, the two noble teachers, Abul-A’laa Mawdoodi and Sayyid Qutb” (p.215).

And he also says in the footnote on page 237, “And there are some noble writes who have brought about benefit, amongst them the teachers: Dr. Muhammad al-Bahhee, the teacher Sayyid Qutb, the teacher Mohammad Qutb, and the teacher al-Mawdudi.” On page 347 he says, “The Rabbaani scholar, Sayyid Qutb”.

There are in fact many others, but this is just by way of illustration. Now the questions must be asked. It is known that the Salafis are the most vehement of people in defending the Islamic aqeedah and refuting its opposers and adulterators. And they are the most vehement of people in defending the honour of the Prophets and their Companions. It is hardly conceivable that any Salafi can remain silent upon the calamities which arose from Sayyid Qutb. It is in fact impossible. And we see the Salaf in all times and ages, refuted the Innovators, on issues less serious than what Qutb spoke of propounded.

In light of all of that how can it be that the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Rabee’, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, Shaikh Muqbil, Shaikh Abdullaah ad-Duwaish, Shaikh al-Lahaydaan, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and many others are agreed upon the refutation and subjugation of this Rafidee Heretical Innovator, and the subduing of his books, and preventing them from reaching the youth – and all of these are Salafi Shaikhs, known for their Salafiyyah. So how can all this be, and then we have a band of claimants of Salafiyyah, who claim they defend the aqeedah of Salafiyyah (like Safar al-Hawaali), and then not only to they raise, promote, defend, aggrandise this Innovating Heretic, and promote his teachings and his books, and his doctrines and his manhaj, AND at the same time scorn and ridicule and abuse and slander our scholars by calling them “senile” and “scholars of women’s menses and impurities” and so on?

How can that be, and does it add up, and what exactly is going on here? The answers are clear. These people are hardcore Qutubites, born of the Awakening of Qutubism, nurtured under the wing of Mohammad Qutb, fostered by him – and so they became the spokesmen for the Qutubi Manhaj in Saudi Arabia, which would later see the takfir of the sinners, takfir by way of Kabaa’ir, calls to open rejection, calls to belittlement of the scholars and ridicule of them, civil strife, attributing kufr to the society at large, using the modes and methods of the Infidels in bringing about reform and so on.

There are also others like Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi (known as Isaam Barqaawi), a hardcore Qutubi, Takfiri. Abu Qataadah al-Philasteene at-Takfiri, but the most commonly known ones are those that we have listed above.

In addition to these neo-Qutubites there are also their counterparts in the West, and how many there are. They used to defend Sayyid Qutb vehemently, but since our Ulamaa have refuted him they now take a different tact. Which is to admit his mistakes and to criticise them, but they do not actually warn and caution from him as the Salaf would. So they are still playing games, and they are still Qutubiyyah, whether they admit his mistakes or not. Until they openly warn, and caution the youth from his books and adhere to the manhaj of the Salaf in this particular affair, then indeed they will remain Qutubiyyah and shall be treated as the lowly, deceiving pretentious ones.

Indeed, their attachment to Sayyid Qutb, is only due to their subscribing to the manhaj of the Khawaarij that Sayyid Qutb himself was upon and which is concerned with the affairs of rule, rulership and legislation.

Stated Salaah as-Saawee: “As for the **Qutubiyyoon** (the Qutubis), then their methodology (manhaj) is based **primarily upon the issue of legislation (tashree’)**, explaining its link with the foundation of the religion and explaining that the various flaws that have engulfed the legal structures in our contemporary societies nullify the contract of Islaam and demolish the very basis of Tawheed. **It is also known that the books that represent this particular orientation and which outline its methodology are the books of the teacher, Sayyid Qutb – may Allaah have mercy upon him – in the field of da’wah and public speeches.**” (Madaa Shar’iyat il-Intimaa ilal Ahzaab wal-Jamaa’aat al-Islaamiyyah p.171)

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked, “Whoever opposes the usool (foundations) of Salafiyyah from amongst those (contemporaries) who are around us [such as the Qubutiyyah Jadeedah, Surooriyyah, Turaathiyyah and others, Trans.] and assists and supports other methodologies [such as those of Sayyid Qutb or Mohammad Suroor, or Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and so on, Trans.], such that he praises their founders [such as Sayyid Qutb, Trans.] and their theorists (mufakkiroon) [such as Mohammad Qutb, the Mufakkir, Harakiyy, and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, the Bannaawite, Trans.] is it obligatory to associate him with them in order that the people may take caution from him and so that they do not become deceived by his manhaj?”

He answered, **“Whoever opposes the manhaj (methodology) of the Salaf and praises the methodologies which oppose the manhaj of the Salaf and praises those who are upon it, then he is considered to be upon the actual opposing methodologies himself. It is necessary to advise him and to call him (to the truth), for if he returns to the truth then so, otherwise he is to be abandoned and cut off...”** (al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah, p.105).

Stated Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, **“And whoever holds a good opinion of them – and claims that he does not know their true condition – then he is**

acquainted with their true condition. So if he does not separate from them and make open his rejection of them, then he is to be counted from amongst them. And as for the one who says that their words have a ta'weel (interpretation) that is in agreement with the Sharee'ah, then he is actually from amongst their leaders and chiefs. And if he is an intelligent person, then he will know his own lie in what he has stated (i.e. knows he is uttering a lie)." (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 2/133).

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, **"It is obligatory to punish everyone who ascribes himself to them – the people of innovation – or who defends them, or who praises them, or who reveres their books, or who detests that they should be talked about, or who begins to make excuses for them by saying he does not understand what these words mean or by saying that this person also authored another book and what is similar to these types of excuses, which are not made except by an ignoramus or a hypocrite. Rather, it is obligatory to punish everyone who knows of their condition and did not assist in repelling their evil, for repelling their evil is one of the greatest of obligations."** Majmoo ul-Fataawaa (2/132).

So this is the condition of the Qutubiyyah, and no one doubts about their condition except one who is ignorant of their manhaj, or one who is a person of desires. And whoever does not assist in repelling them and their evil, when knowing of it, then he is amongst them. And from this the true Salafis, those who adhere to the Salafi Manhaj, are distinguished from the Imposters and false pretenders.

There are also those who actually defend and ally with the Qutubiyyah. And this includes the likes of Ali Timimi, Idris Palmer, Salim Morgan, Abu Aaliyah Surkheel of UK London and others whose true orientations have become apparent over the last years and whose defence of the Qutubiyyah is known and made public – by themselves in fact. So we caution from all the confused and biased partisans.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 23

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 32: How are the Salafis approached by the Qutubiyyah and the Activists in general and led to confusion?

In previous times, many people were unaware of the calamities of Qutb, his Rafd, Khaarijiyyah, and general compound ignorance and deviation. Thus the promotion of his books was easy and facile. Following the initiation of the Qutubi Inquisition by Shaikh Abdullaah ad-Duwaish and later continued with earnest by Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, and then by the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, Atharis in general, the situation has been reached where any attempt to promote these books or to promote Sayyid Qutb is recognised by every Sunni, Salafi as a sign of heresy and deviation and innovation. Only the most arrogant, and unashamed Qutubites continue in this open affront and insult to the intellect, and insult to the Salafi aqeedah and the Prophets, the Caliphs and the Companions - such as ash-Shu'aybee, al-Awdah, al-Hawali and their followers and loyalists. All of this despite the fact that the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah that they had employed previously, has also been demolished and refuted from its very foundations.

However, there are many who are affected by this da'wah, and call to this da'wah, but realising the difficulty that now faces them, they have tried a different approach, in order to invite the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah into the fold of Qutubism. Even the unashamed Qutubites realise and know this. This new stratagem has actually come from the Qutubi Intelligentsia, those mentioned previously and we will summarise it here. It is also important to bear in mind, that strategies change and develop, in light of the existing climate, the prevailing circumstances, and in light of specific events and occurrences that take place over time. So in our analysis below, we will try to incorporate that in our discussion of the new Qutubi strategy, and its proliferation in recent times.

ONE: Previously the Classical Qutubiyyah used to be upon the absolution of Sayyid Qutb in the field of Haakimiyyah. This would necessitate takfir of all rulers who did not judge by

what Allaah has revealed, even if that were in the form judging wrongly due to bribery. The Veteran Qutubiyyah of old were upon this, and they utilised the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa'idah to establish their takfir. In those times, the Qutubi figureheads like Mohammad Qutb would actually speak of Irjaa' (back in the mid to late 80s), and continuously mention it. Irjaa' means to separate actions from Imaan. Those who did not perform takfir of the rulers would be accused with Irjaa' (meaning that they claim actions do not expel from Imaan, just like beliefs and sayings do). The Contemporary neo-Qutubiyyah have taken a different approach.

TWO: The aim and objective is to actually arrive at takfir based upon the prevailing condition that exists today in the Muslims lands, that of the presence of secular laws, in greater or lesser amounts, and little Sharee'ah rule. Of course this varies from country to country with some countries having a better situation than others. So takfir based upon this situation is the desired goal – such that the Qutubi programme can be effected.

THREE: The starting point to give da'wah to the Salafis is to first pick on those fataawaa of those Scholars who consider the organised and systematic institution of non-Islamic laws to be major kufr absolutely. In other words where there is a total or majority replacement of Islamic laws. However, it ought to be noted that there is a difference between those who hold that this act is major kufr, while they are actually upon the Salafi manhaj in general (and this is our scholars like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, and others) and between those who hold this viewpoint, while they are actually upon the Qutubi manhaj, and while they show walaa and baraa for the Innovators, like Sayyid Qutb, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Hassan al-Bannaa and others – all of whom have deviated in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah.

And as for the issue itself, (i.e. as to whether this act is major kufr absolutely), then there is a difference of opinion. So many scholars do not consider the likes of this “replacement” to be major kufr unless the person makes Istihlaal or Juhood or has some associated beliefs that necessitate kufr, since in their view, whether a person brings one law, or twenty, or fifty or a hundred, or whether he institutes them or not, or whether he brings a whole new system – none of this can conclusively indicate that he did this while making Istihlaal, or considering these laws to be better or equal to Allaah's law. It could occur due to other factors like excessive dhulm or fisq and so on. Hence, they adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf upon this, and carry this act upon the tafseel of the Salaf.

Hence, those upon the Qutubi Manhaj, seeing this difference, then use it in order to give da'wah to the Salafis. So the first of what is presented are the fataawaa of our scholars like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, along with many other generalised and ambiguous fataawaa, like those of Imaam Ibn Baaz (which are actually clarified elsewhere), likewise those of Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen and others. These fataawaa are used as “softeners” or “tranquillisers” so that the general, overall, extremist manhaj of Haakimiyyah and Takfir can be introduced. And this shifts the balance away from the manhaj of the Prophets in calling to Allaah and rectifying the society, and moves it towards the manhaj of the Political Activists, which is an over-emphasised and

exaggerated involvement in the affairs or rule, rulership, politics and shurocracy and other affairs.

It is here that you observe some strange behaviour from the Qutubiyyah and those affected by them. On the one hand they take the fataawaa of our scholars selectively. So they take Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan's fatwaa on total institution of secular laws, but then they reject his fataawaa on Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah being a bid'ah, and his fatwaa in praise of the Saudi State and that it judges by the Sharee'ah and that this is only a thorn in the throat of the people of dissension and hypocrisy, and his verdicts on the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Mohammad Qutb and his followers, and his verdicts on the ways and means of da'wah, and also his praises for the book of Shaikh Rabee' on the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and so on. So the likes of these fataawaa are either brushed aside, or interpolated.

Anyhow, the point being that they use the isolated viewpoints of our scholars in order to call to their well-defined manhaj. It is important to take note of this.

FOUR: To strengthen the “tranquillising” effect of the above, they then claim that instituting non-Islamic laws, on a wide-scale basis, is major kufr by Ijmaa of the Muslim scholars. And this Ijmaa' does not exist. Since, this is an issue which has no clear textual proof from the Book and the Sunnah, it is largely a matter of evaluating as to whether this act can be considered to major kufr absolutely (just like kicking the Qur'aan or reviling Allaah) or not, and in light of that whether the tafseel of the Salaf can be applied to it or not. Hence, the difference amongst OUR scholars. It is far from a matter of Ijmaa'. Nevertheless, the Qutubiyyah like to portray it as such, so that they can strengthen their da'wah. Additionally, they claim that any opposition to this “so-called” Ijmaa' is representative of Irjaa'.

In recent times, certain events took place, which gave the Qutubiyyah a field day, and which allowed them to strengthen their accusation of Irjaa'. In reality, it allowed them to hijack the da'wah even further.

The first of which was the fatwaa against al-Anbari and Shaikh Fawzaan's critique of him and ascribing Irjaa' to him. As for the accusation of Irjaa', then in and of itself it is pure falsehood, and it is a severe error. Since, this accusation of Irjaa' is based upon something that is not even agreed upon amongst the scholars, and it would necessitate that Shaikh Ibn Baaz, and Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbaad and Shaikh al-Albaani and others are all upon Irjaa' for holding the view that is the view of al-Anbari, since these scholars have all restricted the kufr of the one guilty of ruling by and instituting secular laws to Istihlaal, Juhood and the likes.

And as for the fatwaa against Shaikh Ali Hasan, then that was rejected by many scholars and refuted, and it was an erroneous Ijtihaad. And Shaikh Ali Hasan replied with a detailed knowledge-based reply to which the Committee has not responded to date, and Shaikh Ali's reply was commended by many scholars, including Shaikh Hussain Aal ash-Shaikh. The only people who rejoiced with this fatwaa were the “revolutionary takfiris” as

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said, and this in fact strengthens and corroborates what we have mentioned – that the neo-Qutubiyyah and those poisoned with the adulterated methodologies of today, hijacked the da'wah by using these differences that occurred within Ahl us-Sunnah – and rejoiced with them.

This is why you saw the well known Qutubists of the West, like Ali at-Timimi and Idris Palmer, and also Qutubi organisations like JIMAS and others, rejoice with this fatwaa. In the past, they used to reject the verdicts of our scholars, like the most recent verdicts of our scholars which forbid co-operation with the deviant parties and groups. So these people, instead of spreading these new fataawaa which warned from these groups and forbade co-operation with them, they would actually spread the very old and outdated fatawaa which spoke well of Ikhwaan and Tabligh. Likewise, they rejected the fataawaa on Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah, or at the least, they began to save face afterwards and say it was a matter of Ijtihaad and the scholars differ (although they did not allow this position to be held in the Halabi Affair). Similarly, they ignored the fatwaa of the Committee which banned the neo-Qutubiyyah (Safar and Salman) from giving lectures, due to the “danger” to the society that they posed (i.e they were calling towards the manhaj of the Khawaarij). Likewise, it took a very long time for them to accept – only on the surface - Shaikh Rabee's destruction of the Rafidee Heretic around whom their manhaj was based, and who was the superglue of all Contemporary Activists and Political Machinators. So even though fatwaa after fatwaa was presented to them, they did not disown themselves from this Raafidee Heretic that is Sayyid Qutb, and they did not warn from him and his books in the manner that our Scholars and the Salaf did in general with respect to the Innovators. In fact, today they have only reached the affair where they know they must make mention of his errors, in order to avoid being recognised as Qutubi Loyalists. But they do not actually warn from him and make the youth flee from his books of bid'ah and hawaa.

Anyhow, coming back to the original point, these occurrences were monopolised upon by the neo-Qutubiyyah, who rejoiced and had a field day, whereas in reality, they were issues that were inside of Ahl us-Sunnah. This only lent support to them because of what they were already upon of the extremism in their haakimiyyah, having imbibed that from Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Salman al-Awdah, Safar al-Hawali and others from the neo-Bannaawites and neo-Qutubites. When the scholars began to reject the Permanent Committee's verdict on Shaikh Ali Hasan's books on takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, the neo-Qutubiyyah were humiliated – and their initial rejoicing also uncovered much of what they used to hide.

FIVE: So by using the above matters as a starting point, the neo-Qutubiyyah begin to confuse and bewilder the Salafi youth. So they (the Qutubiyyah) display an open love and attachment to Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others, though this is only a selective attachment. Since, to this day, they do not act upon the fatwaas of Shaikh Fawzaan on Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah, and nor upon his fatwaas on Sayyid Qutb and his books and nor upon his fatwaas on Mohammad Qutb and so on. Anyhow, they display love and attachment to Shaikh Fawzaan and also other Shaikhs in whom they can find some sort of political expediency for their da'wah. And then, claiming and posing to be Salafis, upon the correct manhaj, loving our scholars, they then confuse and bewilder mostly the

ignorant Salafis, those who are unaware of these matters and who are unaware of the reality of the Qutubi da'wah, where it came from, how it operates, what its goals are and so on.

SIX: This point of confusion that is then reach will be used to lead and direct the confused individual into different directions. So some people that we have observed have subsequently been led to the da'wah of Abu Qataadah al-Philasteene at-Takfiri, through this particular route, and signs of takfir 'alal itlaaq (absolute takfir) are observed and witnessed. Then others are led to believe that Sayyid Qutb was indeed an Imaam of our times, since he raised the "Flag of Haakimiyyah"(!!) - that is the narrow and restricted Kharijite Haakimiyyah, and so this person while fleeing from what he thinks is Irjaa', then falls into another form of Irjaa', that is Irjaa' to the Innovators. Then others are led to an extremism and exaggeration in Jihaad, in that they fall into an orientation that calls for destructive Jihaads against the "apostate" rulers – and that violence is the only solution to today's status quo. And then others become polarised against the rest of Ahl us-Sunnah, such that they then begin to hate and despise those who actually refute the Qutubi manhaj and its extremism and exaggeration – without them actually realising what has happened and what is going on.

So the point being here that many of those who have been affected by the shubuhaat of the Qutubiyyah, are led in different directions, after they have first been led to confusion on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. Once, they have been put into confusion and bewilderment on this issue and made to think that it is ONLY this issue which is at the heart of the matter, they are then in a position to be led into different directions.

In reality, the likes of these people did not realise that Qutubism is a well-defined manhaj with lots of different aspects to it, which as whole, merge together to create a particular orientation which leads to extremism and exaggeration, especially in the fields of takfir, haakimiyyah and political work. And this leads to a departure from the Prophetic Methodology – thus making matters worse and prolonging even further, the realisation of authority and victory, which is granted by Allaah in the first place. So not realising this, and thinking that the issues relate only to an academic discussion of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and its forms, types, and rulings, they then became bewildered, and this state of bewilderment is monopolised upon by the neo-Qutubiyyah in order to call to their da'wah.

SEVEN: In brief, this is only a description of one of the routes and avenues that are taken in order to confuse the Salafis, and to destabilise them and to then lead them to the Qutubi Haraki Manhaj. The way out from all of this, is to realise that there are three groups of people:

The first: Those who are upon the manhaj of the Salaf in the generality of the affairs, clearly and manifestly. They have a particular viewpoint on the ruler who systematically removes all Islamic laws and institutes non-Islamic laws, and say that this major kufr absolutely.

The second: Those who are upon the manhaj of the Salaf in the generality of the affairs, clearly and manifestly. They have a particular viewpoint on the ruler who systematically removes all Islamic laws and institutes non-Islamic laws, and say that this does not exit from the tafseel of the Salaf, since whether he devises his own law, or adopts those of others, and then rules by them, whether in one law, or ten, or fifty, or a hundred, then all of this falls upon the tafseel of the Salaf, in that only when he makes Istihlaal, or Juhood or claims that these laws are better or equal to the Sharee'ah, only then is it major kufr.

Between themselves, these two groups may have a knowledge based discussion.

The third: The neo-Qutubiyyah, the Takfiris, the Political Activists and others, from the followers of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Safar al-Hawaali, Salman al-Awdah and others, all of whom are upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb of Haakimiyyah and Takfir and Activism and so on. They are NOT upon the manhaj of the Salaf in the generality of affairs, rather they are upon something else entirely. It is these that have monopolised upon the above difference, and so they use it to call to their da'wah.

Therefore, realise that:

- a) There is a difference **AMONGST** Ahl us-Sunnah with respect to an issue that is related to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.
- b) There is a difference **BETWEEN** Ahl us-Sunnah and the Qutubiyyah and those affected by them in the affairs of manhaj as a whole.
- c) The Qutubiyyah enter into our da'wah, and then use the difference in the one issue (**amongst** Ahl us-Sunnah) in order to hide and conceal the difference in the overall manhaj **between** Ahl us-Sunnah and them!!
- d) Once they have entered the da'wah through this backdoor, in this manner, they then start to erode the attachment that the Salafis have to their scholars and accuse the scholars with Irjaa' and other affairs, leading the Salafis to a situation of confusion

If you realise and appreciate this, then no Haraki, Qutubi, Charlatan will be able to deceive and mislead you O Sunni!! And if you wish to learn more about what is called the "The Muqaddimah of Aal Qutb" (i.e. the way the Qutubi da'wah is introduced to Ahl us-Sunnah) then read GRV070010.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 24

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 33: Can you explain a bit more about this difference amongst Ahl us-Sunnah on the one who rules by the secular laws in all or most affairs, and then between Ahl us-Sunnah and the Hizbiyyoon (Partisans)?

As we mentioned in the previous answer, there are three groups that one need to be aware of. Two of which are agreed upon all matters concerning manhaj, but there is a difference concerning a specific type of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and which is sometimes referred to as “istibdaal” (replacement) or “tabdeel” (changing, distorting) and tashree’ aamm (general legislation). In reality, these terms are highly ambiguous and can point to different meanings – and sometimes these terms are used with the incorrect meanings (such as “tabdeel” for example). Anyhow, the reality that is being referred to is the case of a ruler who rules by the secular law in everything, or almost everything, whether these laws are from his own making or not.

So concerning this one group of scholars (Ibn Baaz, Ibn Uthaimaan, al-Albaani and others) hold that the tafseel of the Salaf applies to this situation, since whether a ruler judged once or a hundred times, or whether he judged to this law on one occasion or a hundred occasions, then that does not indicate Istihlaal, or Juhood or that he considers this law to be equal or better than Allaah’s Law. And that in all of that, it makes no difference whether it was a secular law from the British or French, or whether he devised it himself – and then ruled the people with it.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimaan said, “...then built upon this, our ta’weel (explanation of this verse [5:44]) is based upon what has been mentioned, that we judge that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not the kufr that expels from the religion. However, it is the kufr of action, since the haakim, by committing this, has deviated from the correct way. And it is not to be differentiated in any of that between a man who takes a secular law (qaanoon wad’iyy) from others and then makes it a referent point for judgement in his

state (yuhakkimuhu fee dawlatihi), and between one who devises his own law (qaanoon), and then puts this secular law in place. Since, the most important thing is: Does this law oppose the Heavenly Law or not?” (Fitnat ut-Takfir, p.78, of Shaikh al-Albani, compiled by Shaikh Ali Hasan, originally from the Shaikh’s commentary upon the Fitnah of Takfir, on cassette).

Hence, these scholars refer this situation back to the tafseel of the Salaf, and do not consider the likes of this to be from the major kufr. And they require that a ruler make Istihlaal or claim that what he is ruling by is better than or equal to Allaah’s Sharee’ah. In other words the tafseel of the Salaf extends and applies to this situation, whether he rules by secular laws or those of his own making, whether he does that in one issue or a hundred issues.

Another group of scholars (like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and others) consider the ruler in this situation to have fallen into major kufr, built upon their view that a ruler can only have chosen to rule by these laws (in the manner that he did, i.e. in all or most instances) if he considered them to be better than the Sharee’ah laws. So they hold that this outward act is a conclusive indicator of the underlying beliefs that necessitate kufr. So built upon this they say that this act is major kufr. Note that the way in which they arrive at their position – it is still based upon the tafseel of the Salaf. In other words, built upon the tafseel of the Salaf this act is major kufr. And the reality of the difference between this group and first group is on whether this act conclusively indicates that which necessitates kufr, such as Istihlaal, Juhood, or aspects of belief that necessitate kufr.

Then there is a third group, and they are the Qutubiyyah, Takfeeriyyah, Surooriyyah and their likes. And in reality they have arrived at their position on this issue based upon their being influenced by the extremism and absolution of Sayyid Qutb. So to them, this act is major kufr absolutely, and they treat this act, just like those acts which are major kufr by textual proof and ijmaa’ such as kicking the Qur’aan and reviling Allaah and reviling the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). Hence, any attempt to adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf on this issue is Irjaa’ to these people.

The difference between the first and the third group is about whether the act is major kufr or not. The difference between the second and third group is the way in which the judgement of major kufr (upon the act) is arrived at. Regardless, according to the third group (i.e. the Qutubiyyah), both of the above two groups have fallen into Irjaa’. This is because, according to the Qutubiyyah, even though the second group hold the act to be major kufr, the manner in which they arrive at takfir of the act (according to the Qutubiyyah) is itself representative of Irjaa’ – this is because in the view of the Qutubiyyah, any attempt to link the act being treated as major kufr to the kufr of belief in the heart, is Irjaa’. Hence, in reality their position necessitates that all of our scholars – those who hold that ruling by the secular laws in greater or lesser amounts is not major kufr and those who hold it is major kufr – are all upon Irjaa’ in the affairs of Takfir and Kufr. Many people are not aware of this reality, and great confusion and misguidance is feared for them.

In reality, the third group (the biased activist partisans), when they saw the opportunity to confuse Ahl us-Sunnah and cause turmoil amongst them, they monopolised upon this difference, and used it to confuse and beguile Ahl us-Sunnah – while concealing the fact that they are actually upon the da'wah of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali, al-Awdah, Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah and others.

Question 34: What about the verdict of the Permanent Committee on al-Anbari's book and also Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan's criticisms of al-'Anbari

It should firstly be noted that the previous Permanent Committee, while Imaam Ibn Baaz was the chair, issued numerous verdicts which are in perfect agreement with the view of al-'Anbari himself – and these have been presented elsewhere. Secondly, it should be noted that the view of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen and many others is the actual view of al-Anbari himself.

As for Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan's criticism of al-'Anbari then it is from two angles. The first is based upon Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan's belief that al-Anbari restricts the kufr of the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed (by ruling by the secular laws in greater or lesser amounts) to Juhood only , (i.e. rejecting the judgement of Allaah as a matter of belief). And the second, based upon his observation that al-'Anbari does not speak of what the Shaikh calls "al-Istibdaal at-Taamm", or in other words, totally replacing Sharee'ah laws with secular laws in their entirety, that this is major kufr because the one who falls into it considers the non-Islamic law to be superior, and that al-Anbari did not discuss it or explain it.

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan said (in his critique of al-Anbari), "I say: the kufr of the one who does not rule by what Allaah has revealed, is not restricted to juhood, rather it also applies to complete replacement (bal, yatanaawal al-istibdaala at-taamm), and likewise, the one who makes istihlaal of this action, even if only in some laws, and without him making juhood, or if he says: the judgement of other than Allaah is better than the judgement of Allaah, or if he says: that they are both equal, as the people of knowledge have textually stated (concerning this). Until even if he said, that the judgment of Allaah is better, but it is permissible to judge by other than it..." (Majallat ud-Da'wah no. 1749 4th Rabeel ul-Awwal 1421)

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan also said, "This tabdeel that you have mentioned and which is kufr by Ijmaa' of the Muslims does not exist, but it is something that is assumed by you, none of the rulers of today speak of it and nor in the past, but there is istibdaal, and this is choosing the secular laws as a replacement to the Islamic Sharee'ah, and abolishing the Sharee'ah law courts, and this is kufr also. This is because, the ruler completely abolishes (yunahheehaa nihaa'iyyan) the Sharee'ah, and puts in its place secular laws. So what then remains of Islaam? And he did not do this except that he adopts these laws while he considers them to be superior to the Sharee'ah." (Majallat ud-Da'wah no. 1749 4th Rabeel ul-Awwal 1421)

As for the first angle, then al-'Anbari makes takfir of the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed on account of Juhood, Istihlaal, I'tiqaad and does not restrict it to Juhood alone – and this is manifestly clear from al-'Anbari's writings and his book under question. If al-'Anbari had restricted the kufr in this example to be only due to Juhood and nothing else, then this would have been a shade of Irjaa'. But the reality is otherwise. And if al-'Anbari had indeed done so, we would have not hesitated in supporting the accusation of Irjaa' - hence, this is not a matter of taqleed!! But the affair is not like that, and al-Anbari is cleared of Irjaa'.

Secondly, irrespective of the terms used (Istibdaal, Tabdeel, Tashree' Aaamm), the reality that is being pointed to, which is that of ruling by the secular laws, in greater or lesser amounts, then al-Anbari's view is that of the three Imaams (Ibn Baz, al-Albani, Ibn Uthaimeen) who refer the matter back to Istihlaal and I'tiqaad – adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf.

Thirdly, the angle that Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan is coming from, is different to the angle of the Takfiris and Qutubis. For Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan believes al-'Anbari restricts the kufr of the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed to predominantly Juhood only¹. And had this been a correct assertion, we would have supported Shaikh Salih al-

¹ And this is because al-'Anbari, in the course of his refutation of the Takfiris, predominantly speaks of their unrestricted takfir in the absence of Juhood and Istihlaal, which is a known reality. However, he also speaks of takfir by way belief in the superiority of the secular laws, quoting the well known statement of Imaam Ibn Baaz:

“And whoever ruled by other than what Allaah has revealed (i.e. the secular laws) then he will not be in other than one of four situations:

- 1) The one who says: 'I rule by this because it is superior to the Sharee'ah of Islaam.' Such a one is disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief
- 2) The one who says: 'I rule by this because it is like the Sharee'ah of Islaam, so ruling by it is permissible and ruling by the Sharee'ah is permissible'. Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief.
- 3) The one who says: 'I rule by this and ruling by the Sharee'ah of Islaam is superior but ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is permissible (jaa'iz).' Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of major disbelief.
- 4) The one who says: 'I rule by this' while he believes that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not permissible and who says that 'the Sharee'ah of Islaam is superior and it is not permissible to rule by other than it' but he is neglectful, or treats matters lightly, or does this action due to a reason which proceeds from his rulers, then he is a disbeliever in the sense of minor disbelief which does not eject from the religion - and it is considered one of the greatest of major sins.”

(Al-Hukmu bi-Ghairi Maa Anzalallaahu wa Usool ut-Takfeer p. 71/72)

As for his viewpoint that adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf, until even when a ruler judges in most instances, in his state, by the secular laws, then in that issue he is upon the viewpoint of the three Imaams of our times. And this is in agreement with the saying of Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan in terms of the underlying principle, the only difference being that whereas Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan considers that when a person rules by nothing but the secular laws in their entirety, this is indicative, in and of itself that the person is holding beliefs that necessitate kufr (i.e. that these laws he is judging by are superior and better). Whereas al-Anbari', following the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz

Fawzaan's viewpoint. But the matter is not like that, as is clear to anyone who is not given to taqleed. As for the Qutubiyyah and their likes, then to them, ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is major kufr absolutely (just like kicking the Qur'aan and reviling Allaah etc.) and hence any attempt to restrict this act to Juhood OR Istihlaal OR I'tiqaad and to condition takfir upon these matters is Irjaa'. However, seeing that they can find support for what they are already upon, the Biased Partisans, utilised the words of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and the Committee in order to hijack the scene, in a manner that was truly obscene. This was because prior to these incidents, they would actually accuse anyone who would not make takfir of the rulers in absolute terms to be Murji'ah. And it is mutawaatir from them that they would reject the verdicts of OUR scholars likes Shaikh Fawzaan and others, on the matters of the groups of sects and innovation, the da'wah of Mohammad Suroor, Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah, on refuting the Innovators, the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah, Takfir, and many other affairs. In those days, it was known that they would belittle our scholars and call them "pawns" and "stooges" and so on. But now, it is political expediency, opportunism, and Machiavellian Machinations.

Hence, the accusation of Irjaa' is unfounded, and the verdict itself is an incorrect Ijtihaad on behalf of the Permanent Committee. The only ones who have actually benefited from this are the Qutubiyyoon, Surooriyyoon and the biased, confused partisans, whose only concern is to make the Salafi manhaj and its adherents to fall, and to cause splits amongst Ahl us-Sunnah and their scholars. Beware of those Charlatans who have arisen, who are Qutubi Wolves, in sheeps' clothing – and they claim that they are defending the Permanent Committee and strengthening its position and defending its honour – whereas in reality, they are from the third group mentioned above, who are actually upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, not the manhaj of the Salaf, and they wish to devour the Salafi youth in this manner. Because of the presence of the People of Desires who have another agenda and goal, which is Takfir, Khurooj, Activism and so on, this affair (i.e this verdict) became a source of great confusion and trial for many weak and unperceptive Salafis, when these Activists scavenged upon it and utilised it for their own ends. So not realising what is going on, they became confused and became less resolute and so wavered in doubt.

and others, does not hold this in absolute terms, and considers that this situation still falls within the tafseel of the Salaf, since whether he judged by one or a thousand laws that oppose the Sharee'ah, within his state, that does not indicate he views them better, absolutely, just like when a person consistently fornicates, takes usury and gambles, it does not necessitate that he considers these sins to be more virtuous than abandoning them.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 25

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 35: What about the verdict of the Permanent Committee on two of Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi's books?

You should know first that the matter is exactly as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (rahimahullaah) stated, which is **“the only ones who rejoiced with the fatwaa are the revolutionary takfiris”**. In the days gone by the Activists, Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Takfiriyyah and all, would actually disdain our Ulamaa, slander them and revile them, and also reject their verdicts on a variety of different issues that related to the affairs of da'wah and manhaj. And examples of this have already preceded in previous answers.

As for the fatwaa in question, then that arose on account of certain “advisors” to the Committee who had tried numerous times to get the Committee to issue a verdict, previously. The fatwaa itself was rejected by many scholars, amongst them Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen himself.

Shaikh Hussain Aal ash-Shaikh (Imaam of Masjid an-Nabawi) stated, **“How can the verdict ascribe to the Murji'ah the saying that actions are a condition for the perfection of Imaan, when the Murji'ah themselves do not even consider that Imaan can be deficient to begin with, such that it is then possible for Imaan to become perfect and complete?!”**, the Shaikh outlined the error of the accusation in the fatwa. (Refer to the cassettes 'Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad al-Haramayn')

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain (a Minister of Religious Affairs from Saudi Arabia, stationed in Jordan) stated, **“As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best**

of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)... As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists... (Refer to “Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn” and also “Mujmal I'tiqaad...” in which an actual photocopy of this letter is included at the beginning.)

This question was presented to Ash-Shaikh Saalih As Sadlaan the morning dated 7th of Shawwaal, 1421A.H./January 2, 2001C.E. at Masjidul Haraam.

Question: “Many of the students in the university are arguing about the fatwaa that warns against Ash-Shaikh 'Alee Al Halabee. What is your advice to us about it and what position should we take?”

Answer: **“No, this should not be applied to Ash-Shaikh 'Alee Al-Halabee**, for he is well-known to have a **sound 'aqeedah**. This fatwaa was **an improper ijtihaad** (“ijtihaadun fee ghayri mahallihi”), as 'Alee is well-known to us (“ma'roof indanaa”), a good man (“rajulun tayyib”), possessor of the correct 'aqeedah (“saahibul 'aqeedah”). **My advice to you is to abandon this fatwaa (“utrakil-fatwaa tamaaman”)** and focus on other things, **as it was an unsuitable and improper ijtihaad(“fee ghayri mahalli”)**”. End of the Shaikh's reply.

Some of the students of knowledge from Yemen, from the students of Abul-Hasan al-Ma'rabi phoned Shaikh Muhammad bin Salih al-Uthaimeen – rahimahullaah - on 28th Jumaada al-Aakhirah 1421H and asked him, “What is your view concerning the fatwaa issued by the Permanent Committee concerning the two books of Shaikh Ali al-Halabi, “At-Tahdhir Min Fitnah of Takfir” and “Saihatu Nadheer” and what is your view concerning it?

The Shaikh replied, **“I have not read the two books, and this fatwaa, I do not like the fact that it was issued, because there is within it what creates turmoil amongst the people - and my advice to the students of knowledge is they should not give any care for the fatwaa of fulaan or fulaan...”** (Cassette: Phone Discussion With Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, Dated: 28th Jumaada al-Aakhirah 1421H)

And many others from the people of knowledge also rejected the fatwaa, including Shaikh Muhammad bin 'Abdul-Wahhaab al-Bannaa, Shaikh Saleh as-Saleh, many of the students of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen and those of Imaam Ibn Baaz. Leaving aside all of that, the position of Shaikh Ali on the subjects of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed were synonymous with those of the three Imaams of our time, anyhow.

Shaikh Ali Hasan wrote an excellent 52 page reply to the Committee's allegations which has had no reply to date (refer to MSC060008). The behaviour of the Hizbiyyoon in this whole affair was a great blessing for Ahl us-Sunnah, for it allowed them to immediately to see the opportunism and deceit inherent in their actions.

Shaikh Hussain Aal ash-Shaikh also stated, during his visit to the US at the QSS conference in Chicago, when asked about this, that the verdict was not a judgement upon Shaikh Ali Hasan (as the Qutubiyyoon and Harakiyyoon portrayed it), and nor was it a judgement upon his aqeedah or manhaj. Rather, it was a discussion and contention of certain points in one of his books. And he also noted that Shaikh Ali Hasan replied with a detailed reply, which rebutted the claims. This cassette is available from those who hosted the conference and also from QSS in the states.

As for the Qutubiyyah and Hizbiyyoon, amongst the Ruwaibidah, then their slogans were altogether different. Amongst such Ruwaibid elements were the well-known Qutubists of the West, amongst them Idris Palmer¹, who rejoiced with the fatwaa stating, "Alhumdulillah, a major figurehead of this false movement has been exposed as Murjiah masquerading as Salafis" in his communication dated 16th September 2000. And Shaikh Ibn 'Uthaimeen refuted these Ruwaibidah in his well known defence of Imaam al-Albaani, and clearing him of Irjaa' and stated that it is those who are desirous of takfir and those who share with the characteristics of the munaafiqs (in their mockery of the believers) that make this accusation of Irjaa'.

In the days gone by, no heed did they pay to the verdicts of our Scholars on the books of Sayyid Qutb, his great calamities and his statements of kufr and apostasy. Most of our Scholars had spoken on this affair, including Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and many others. However, no heed did they pay, and they continued to make walaa and baraa' for the sake of a Rafidite Heretic who called for the abolition of parts of the Sharee'ah, claiming that they are no longer applicable to the current times (i.e. slavery) – and who also uttered kufr and apostasy by his mockery of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam).

No heed did they pay when their extremist form of al-Haakimiyyah was declared an innovation and anyone who spoke with it to be an Innovator. Many of them persisted and claimed it was a matter of ijtihaad and difference of opinion (and they never utilised this principle for al-Anbari or al-Halabi) whereas others, retreated in the snake burrow, and whereas previously they had assaulted Ahl us-Sunnah (merely because they did not speak with their innovation), they then, in order to save face, decided to adopt Ibn al-Qayyim's nomenclature of Tawheed, which is the Tawheed of knowledge and acquaintance and the

¹ An Extremist and Fanatical Hizbee and Qutubee, Majnoon Safar and Salman. Refer to GRV070005. His enmity to the Salafees is a matter well-known and famous. He gets angry for the sake of the neo-Qutubiyyah and their sayyid, but mockery of Moosa (alaihis-salaam) and takfir of Banu Umayyah, and the innovations of the Jahmiyyah and Ash'ariyyah and Mu'tazilah, and the call for the abolition of slavery, and revilement of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) does not anger this Fanatical Qutubee – no it is only those who speak of Safar and Salman and their Qutb who anger this diseased partisan – in Allaah is refuge from such ignorance and misguidance and extremist practical neo-Irjaa'.

Tawheedh of intent and purpose – and so in their public and private lectures began to speak with this, whereas previously, they had scorned Ahl us-Sunnah for not accepting the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb they (the Activists) had been preaching. Such people included the Qutubists of the West like Ali at-Timimi and Idris Palmer and others.

Similarly, in the days gone by they rejected the most recent and up to date verdicts of our Scholars on the groups and sects of innovation like Ikhwaan and Tabligh, and instead they promoted the very old and outdated verdicts of the Scholars, allowing co-operation with these groups. So no heed did they pay here either.

Likewise, the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanaah, which was the born-again manhaj of Hassan al-Bannaa being promoted by Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and Salman al-Awdah- who have no repented from this bid'ah to date.

And many other issues. In those days, our Ulamaa were “the scholars of women’s menses”, “senile”, “present in body absent in mind”, “mummified”, “perfect ignorance” and other such slanders that came from the direction of the Political Activists.

So all of this illustrated, walhamdulillah, just as the many blunders that were made by the Qutubiyyah when they decided to come out openly with their da’wah during the Gulf War illustrated – that the Activists are upon an agenda and that their positions are being held, not due to ijtihad and sincere following of the truth wherever it may be, but due to a party-plan and due to Hizbiyyah and other such affairs. So their behaviour during the Halabi Affair was indeed one of the greatest of blessings to Ahl us-Sunnah.

It also allowed Ahl us-Sunnah to perceive the existence of another band of partisans who had been “by-standing” over the years. When the Salafis were refuting the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah and others many of these by-standers would often find fault with this, or at least remain silent and not take a position – despite their knowledge that there was indeed a concerted effort by the neo-Qutubites (like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah) and their followers to promote the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb. Similarly, no word of rebuke was ever heard from them when the Qutubites accused Imaam al-Albaani of the Irjaa’ of Jahm Ibn Safwaan. In short, they sat on the fence.

However, as soon as the verdicts came on Khalid al-‘Anbari and Ali Hasan al-Halabi, immediately, these band of individuals (and perhaps there many more like them in the various parts of the earth), suddenly came out and starting holding positions and began to promote these verdicts and they began to accuse the Salafis with what is unbecoming. And some of them also bent over backwards to defend the Qutubiyyah and their partisan activities. So again, the verdict was yet another blessing in that the people of clarity, were distinguished between those who stirred in the murky waters, lurking therein in the shadows. And yet others then began to claim that Imaam al-Albaani should not be relied upon in matters of creed since he “discovered Salafiyyah” and other such claims.

As for the actual criticisms of the Committee, then some of them are really surprising indeed, and there some clear errors in the verdict – as one can see from Shaikh Ali

Hasan's reply to the Committee. Nevertheless, the Permanent Committee is loved by the Salafis, and they merely made an errant ijtihaad. But it is the Muqallidah and the Hizbiyyoon who cause turmoil and stir in the murky waters.

Finally, there are many verdicts of the PREVIOUS Permanent Committees which actually corroborate the viewpoint of Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi, thus the issue is not one of acceptance or rejection of the Permanent Committee's stances, but it is an issue of proof and evidence that are brought.

In short, the Takfiris, Qutubiyyah and others latched onto this verdict on account of the support it would give to their manhaj in general – which is that of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali and others. As for the issue itself then it is one of mutual discussion and correction amongst the Salafi Mashaayikh, and so far, Shaikh Ali's response – for anyone who is not given to blind following and hawaa – is one that is to be contended with, with all due respect and veneration to the Permanent Committee.

In addition to that – this whole chapter - illustrated the way Shaikh Ali Hasan respected and venerated the Permanent Committee, compared to the disgusting behaviour of the neo-Qutubites (like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah) during the Gulf War and thereafter, when they opposed the verdict of Imaam Ibn Baaz and the Permanent Committee, on a number of issues, and so they fell into insults, slanders, mockery and other such wicked behaviour, which led the youth to break their attachment to the Senior scholars. Indeed, in this there is a lesson for anyone who has understanding – and it also illustrates the difference between those who seek the truth and wish for a constructive dialogue with those who oppose them (i.e. the Salafi Mashaayikh) and between those who are upon a manhaj and who only wish to promote it, at the cost of assaulting the honour of the Major Scholars (i.e. the Qutubi Intelligentsia).



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 26

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 36: What is meant by “Manhaj” and what is its application?

Many people are confused about the meaning of the words “Manhaj” and what is the reality that it refers to. In short, Manhaj is a term that is synonymous with other terms used by our Salaf to refer to adherence to the Sunnah and the Way of the Salaf, such as “as-Sunnah”, or “ash-Sharee’ah”, or “as-Sabeel” – and all of this was in reference to matters of aqeedah and matters of ibaadah and matters of knowledge and learning and so on. In short, it was in reference to the sum whole of the religion – in the manner that the Salaf us-Saalih traversed upon it. Though in the current times, the word “manhaj” has a special application to the ways and means of da’wah, since a great deal of controversy has been entered into this arena by way of the Innovators.

Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan - may Allaah preserve him - said, The reasons for disunity are many. From amongst the main causes are: Firstly, opposing the manhaj (methodology) of the Salaf, the Companions of Allaah's Messenger and those who follow them. So the Salaf had a manhaj that they adhered to; a manhaj in aqeedah (creed), a manhaj in da'wah (calling to Allaah), a manhaj in enjoining good and forbidding evil, a manhaj in how to judge between people. This manhaj, in all situations, was based upon the Book of Allaah and the Sunnah of our Messenger . (Wujoob ut-Tathabbut fil-Akhbaaar p.18)

Thus the Salafis have a Manhaj in every affair and which falls back upon the Book and the Sunnah. They have a manhaj in learning and teaching. They have a manhaj in parenting and upbringing children. They have a manhaj in the manner of da’wah. They have a manhaj in social dealings. They have a manhaj in dealing with the Opposers and the Innovators. They have a manhaj in deriving their aqeedah. They have a manhaj in dealing with the Rulers, and so on.

There are a number of points worthy of mention here:

The first is the error that many sincere Salafis fall into, when restricting manhaj to the field of da'wah only and the field of the people of Innovation and Hizbiyyah. This is correct and true, but not what is intended by "affairs of manhaj" exclusively. Rather, from the Salafi Manhaj (i.e. the Sunnah as a whole) is memorising the Qur'aan, memorising the Sunnah, and striving to understanding them both. Excelling in the Arabic language is from the manhaj. Knowing the Tafseer of the Speech of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, is from the manhaj. All the sciences connected to the Qur'aan is from the manhaj. There is the manhaj of learning and teaching. Thus, the affairs of manhaj are not restricted to specific areas, since the word "manhaj" refers to the unique methodology that the Salafis follow in given subjects and areas, in both knowledge and action, and thus manhaj covers the whole religion. Thus the manhaj of the Salaf in aqeedah, differs with that of the Ash'aris and Mu'tazilah and so on. And likewise their manhaj in the affairs of da'wah is different to those of the Political Activists and so on.

The second is representative of the plot of the Hizbiyyoon and Political Activists who attempt to make a distinction between "aqeedah" and "manhaj" – thereby allowing themselves to adopt adulterated methodologies by arguing that aqeedah is what is most important and must be the basis of unity. And all of this is baatil. This will be discussed later. However briefly, it is as if they are dividing the religion into "important" and "trivial" matters, and then using this as a basis to justify their adulterations and deviations from the Sunnah, or call it deviation from the Manhaj if you like.

In light of the above, when the word Manhaj is used, it is synonymous to the way the word "Sunnah" or "Sharee'ah" has been used by our Salaf. And thus anyone who adhered to the Sunnah, or the Sabeel, or the Sharee'ah, or the Manhaj, will be saved and delivered from the seventy-two destroyed sects. In addition, the word "manhaj" in the current times is often used to relate to the affairs of da'wah, and in which great deviation and confusion has appeared.

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked: "Is [entry into] Paradise and Hellfire dependent upon the correctness of one's Manhaj (methodology)?" His reply: "Yes. When a person's manhaj is correct he will be in Paradise. So if he is upon the manhaj of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih, he will become one of the inhabitants of Paradise by Allaah's permission. And when he travels upon the manhaj of the misguided strayers, he is threatened with the Hellfire." (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah p.77).

Question 37: Has anyone from the people of knowledge alluded to this false differentiation that the Hizbiyyoon make?

Yes, amongst them Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullaah). Imaam al-Albaani was asked, "Some of the youth differentiate between the aqidah of the Salaf and the manhaj of the Salaf so you see some of them upon the aqidah of the Salaf yet they allow themselves to work with some of the methodologies that exist today, even though there maybe what opposes the manhaj of the Salaf within them in terms of practice. So is there a binding link

between the aqidah and manhaj of the Salaf in the practical implementation of the Salafi manhaj?”

The Shaikh replied - in powerful and revealing words: “That which I believe and worship Allaah with is that there are both generalities (in similarity) and specific (aspects) between the Salafi manhaj and aqidah. Aqidah is more specific than manhaj as all of you know. Aqidah has a link with what is called - in the view of many of the Jurists - the “knowledge of tawhid”, and this is the chief and fundamental aspect of Islaam. However, manhaj is more vast than aqidah or tawhid¹. **As for those who claim that the differentiation that has come in this question (between aqidah and manhaj), then they desire by this to make it permissible for themselves to adopt ways and means in their daw'ah to Islaam which the Salaf us-Salih were not upon.** To say this in a different way, they consider that they have the liberty to adopt whatever ways and means they think will help them to convey (and actualise) Islaam, and you are aware of the examples of this type or these types of means.

For example, **open demonstrations and rallies in order to force the rulers to turn their attention to what the society complains about and similar matters.** So we say that what has come in the Book and the Sunnah and what the Salaf us-Salih were upon with respect to objectives, goals and ways and means are sufficient for the Ummah. **However, the reason which leads some of the people to permit themselves to adopt these ways and means, in fact it is correct for me to say that they permit themselves to blindly-follow the disbelievers in the ways that they have adopted in order to actualise what they call either democracy or social justice and other such words which have no reality to them.** So they - I mean these Muslims - permit themselves to blindly follow the disbelievers in these ways and means.

We say, our Lord, the Mighty and Majestic has made removed us from having any need, by our Shari'ah, of this separation which has been explained (i.e. between aqidah and manhaj) and that we should be needy of the disbelievers and that we should take from their ways and means, which might be good for them, (but) only because they have no Shari'ah by which they guide themselves. It is for this reason that we say that manhaj is more vast than aqidah and tawhid, **hence it is necessary to adhere to what the Salaf us-Salih were upon with respect to both these affairs; the one that is vast (manhaj) first and foremost and the one that is more narrow (tawhid), meaning aqidah.**” (Al-Asalah Magazine, Vol 22).

And we find that some from the diseased partisans have claimed that the likes of these affairs are affairs of “ijitihaad”(!!) – and by this they intend to defend the likes of the neo-Qutubiyah, who not only opposed the Sunnah, and left the Salafi manhaj for the Qutubi manhaj, but also erred in matters of aqeedah, such as takfir by way of the Kabaa’ir.

¹ I.e. it is more generic and covers the affairs of the religion in general, as we have outlined earlier.

Question 38: Are there matters of Ijtihaad in the methodology of da'wah and rectification?

The methodology of da'wah is restricted to the Book and the Sunnah and the Way of the Salaf, and is not subject to change and alteration, for Allaah has made it abundantly clear in His Book how He deals with His creation and His Sunan in the creation. And the basis of rectification and correction is also abundantly clear in the Manhaj of Nubuwwah, and in the Manhaj that the Salaf traversed and adopted. Hence, making changes to this manhaj, and altering its priorities and its goals, and the ways to arrive at all of that, is a severe error and is manifest misguidance. There are many deviant orientations which have emerged in the current times, almost all of them having their basis in the teachings of Hasan al-Banna and Sayyid Qutb. So there is an orientation which calls for a destructive Jihaad against the ruling authorities as a starting point. There is another orientation which calls for involvement in Parliamentary elections, and political work – as a fundamental principle in the methodology of reform – and by Allaah what more a blatant contradiction than this, when according to the likes of these people, the framework within they perform their political work and shurocratic activity, is kufr to begin with. Then there is another orientation which seeks to gather the youth together upon emotions, whims and sentiments, all in the name of the grand Awakening(!). And there is another orientation which specialises in the so called fiqh ul-waaqi, which is in reality the fiqh of the adulterated Tawraat, and then extracting prophecies out of it, and encouraging the Youth upon the likes of these affairs, distancing them from proper knowledge and instead nurturing them upon the thrillers that they write, most of which are idle speech and speaking without knowledge, upon other than the Book and the Sunnah.

In reality, there are many different programs of da'wah that have been innovated, all of them opposed to the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah.

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked, “Are the ways and means of da'wah restricted or are they based upon ijtihaad?” He replied, **“The methodologies of da'wah (manaahij ud-da'wah) are restricted to the Book and the Sunnah and the seerah of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). We do not introduce anything into them from ourselves - and they are all present in the Book of Allaah and in the Sunnah of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). And when we invent, we become ruined and cause ruin.** He (alaihis salaatu wassalaam) said: “Whoever introduces something into this affair of ours that which does not belong to it, then it will be rejected”. Yes, there are new ways (wasaa'il) that are used for da'wah today which were not present in the past. Such as voice amplifiers, radios, newspapers, magazines, and rapid methods of communication, so all of these are termed “ways” (wasaa'il, i.e. means) , which are benefited from in da'wah, but they are not to be called methodologies, for the methodologies of da'wah have been explained by Allaah, the Exalted...” to the end of his words. (Al-Ajwibat ul-Mufeedah Min As'ilat il-Manaahij al-Jadeedah pp.22-23).

And in reality, it is the Political Activists who have adulterated the methodologies of da'wah and innovated into them – and as a result entered great turmoil within the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah – leading to great confusion and bewilderment amongst the youth –

many of them wandering here and there and not being able to realise the truth and its people from Hizbiyyah and its rowdy hooligans.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 27

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 39: Can you explain the difference between matters of ‘Ijtihad’ and matters of “Khilaaf (difference)”, as there seems to be some confusion regarding what exactly they are, and when rejection is to be shown concerning them.

Stated Shaikh Fawzee al-Atharee:¹

“Some people, on account of their ignorance, have confused between the meaning of “the issues of opposition” (masaa’il ul-khilaaf) and the meaning of “the issues of ijtihaad” (masaa’il ul-ijtihaad) and so they have thought the meaning of them both is the one and same!!! Then they built upon this that there is no rejection to be shown for the issues of khilaaf. This is an error. This is because the issues of khilaaf are more general than the issues of ijtihaad. Amongst the issues of difference are those in which differing is allowed and they are the issues of ijtihaad and this is what is meant by the Ulamaa when they state, “there is no rejection to be shown in the issues of ijtihaad” and amongst these issues are those in which differing is not allowed, and they are those that oppose the Book or the Sunnah or an Ijmaa’ (consensus). And it is obligatory to reject these matters and the Ulamaa, past and present have never ceased to warn against whoever opposed any of that. And if rejection had not been shown to any of that, it would have led to the changing (tabdeel) of the religion and its distortion.

Ibn al-Qayyim has spoken of this in I’laam al-Muwaqqi’een (3/288) saying, **“Their saying ‘there is no rejection to be shown for the issues of khilaaf’ is not**

¹ Shaikh Fawzee al-Atharee is one of the students of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimin from Bahrain and he studied with the Shaikh for 10 years or so. Shaikh Fawzee exposed many of the biased partisans and revealed their innermost secrets, especially those amongst the Turaathi sect of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq.

correct. For rejection is to be shown either to the saying and fatwaa or to the action. As for the first, if it is a saying that opposes the Sunnah or an Ijmaa' it is obligatory to reject it by unanimous agreement. And if it is not the case (that it opposes any of that) then it explaining its weakness or its opposition to the evidence is similar to it in rejection.

As for an action, then if it is in opposition to the Sunnah or an Ijmaa' then it is obligatory to reject it according to the various degrees of showing rejection. And how can a faqeeh (jurist) say that no rejection is to be shown in the issues which are differed over. The Fuqahaa (jurists) from all the various factions have clearly spoken of invalidating the judgement of a ruler (i.e. judge, qaadee etc.) when he opposes the Book or the Sunnah, even if some of the Ulamaa are in agreement with him on this issue. As for when there does not exist anything in the Sunnah or from Ijmaa' on this issue then performance of Ijtihaad in this issue is permissible and rejection is not to be shown against one who acted upon this based upon ijtihaad or taqleed.

Certainly, this confusion has arisen from the perspective that a person believes that the issues of khilaaf are actually the issues of ijtihaad, as has been held by numerous factions of people who do not have any ability or firm grounding in knowledge.²

And that which our the Scholars are upon is correct, namely that the issues of ijtihaad, so long as there does not exist any evidence which obligates acting upon it manifestly, such as an authentic hadeeth, which has nothing to contradict it from what is similar to it (in authenticity), then it is permissible – in the absence of any clear and manifest proof which necessitates acting by it – to perform ijtihaad, either due to conflicting evidences or due to the evidences being hidden concerning it.” End of quote from Ibn al-Qayyim.

Hence, the issues of ijtihaad are those in which there is no text from the Book or the Sunnah or from Ijmaa', or those in which there is a text but it is not free of what may oppose it and which has a similar strength to it in terms of being established (i.e. in terms of authenticity) or in its proof of indication.

It is these matters that the Ulamaa intend by their saying, “There is no rejection in the issues of Ijtihaad”. Hence, whoever blindly followed, in these issues of ijtihaad (due to the absence of any decisive proof) then he is not to be shown rejection and nor is he to be abandoned (hajar).

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said in al-Fataawaa (20/207), “Whoever acted upon the issues of ijtihaad based upon the sayings of one of the Ulamaa, then he is not shown rejection on account of that and nor is he abandoned. And whoever acted upon one of two sayings, then he is not shown rejection. When there are two views on a matter, then if one

² And this is the state of some of the Ruwaibidah of our times.

of the views seems to be more correct in its evidences, then he may act upon it, and if not then he may blindly-follow one of the Ulamaa who can be depended upon in their explanation of the better and more correct of the two sayings, and Allaah knows best.”

However, not showing rejection in the issues of ijtihaad, does not prevent from speaking about them with Sharee’ah based evidences (i.e. to show their erroneous nature), so take note.

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said in al-Fataawaa (30/80), “The likes of these matters of ijtihaad, then they are not to be shown rejection with the hand (i.e. physically), and it is not anybody’s right to force anybody to follow him in these issues, however they can be spoken about with knowledge-based evidences. So to whomever the correctness of one of two sayings becomes apparent, then he ought to follow it, and whoever blindly-followed the saying of the other one, then he is not to be shown rejection.”

As for the issues of khilaaf (opposition), then they are what oppose the Book or the Sunnah or Ijmaa’.

And it is obligatory to reject this, and the Ulamaa, past and present, have never ceased rejecting anyone who rejects this, and if such oppositions had not been rejected, it would have led to the changing and distortion (tabdeel) of the religion.

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, **“Their saying ‘there is no rejection to be shown for the issues of khilaaf’ is not correct. For rejection is to be shown either to the ruling (made) or to the action. As for the first, if it is a saying that opposes the Sunnah or past Ijmaa’ it is obligatory to reject it by unanimous agreement. And if it is not the case (that it opposes any of that) then it is rejected in the sense of explaining its weakness, and this is in the view of those who say that “the truth is only one”, and this is the generality of the Salaf and the Fuqahaa (Jurists).**

As for an action, then if it is in opposition to the Sunnah or an Ijmaa’ then it is obligatory to reject it according to the various degrees of showing rejection, as we have illustrated from the hadeeth related to the one who drinks nabeedh³ about which there is difference of opinion. Just as the ruling of a judge is invalidated when he opposes a Sunnah, even if he had followed one some of the Ulamaa’ in that. As for when there does not exist anything in the Sunnah or from Ijmaa’ on this issue then performance of Ijtihaad in this issue is permissible and rejection is not to be shown against one who acted upon this based upon ijtihaad or taqleed.

Certainly, this confusion has arisen from the perspective that a person believes that the issues of khilaaf are actually the issues of ijtihaad, as has

³ A form of khamr.

been held by numerous factions of people who do not have any ability or firm grounding in knowledge...” (Refer to Aadaab ush-Sharee’ah 1/169).

... and from all of this, with the help of Allaah, the difference between the issues of khilaaf and the issues of ijtihaad will become clear. Hence, everyone who opposes a clear and explicit text, rejection is shown against him, regardless of whether it is an issue of fiqh, or issues of belief, since we have been ordered to follow the texts in all situations and aspects. Not every issue of opposition (khilaaf) is an issue of ijtihaad. Rather issues of difference of opinion fall into two types as has preceded:

- a) The issues of khilaaf, and these are matters in which a text or texts are found by which the correctness (or falsehood) of the various opinions held in the issue can be determined.
- b) The issues of ijtihaad, and these are the matters in which there is no clear and explicit text which allows the verification of the correctness of the various opinions held in the issue.

Hence, everyone who in his actions or verdicts opposed what the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, then he has brought an evil (munkar), and everyone who sees an evil, then he is obliged to put an end to it, to the extent of his capability. Imaam Muslim reports from Abu Sa’eed al-Khudree – radiiallaahu anhu – who said, “I heard the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) say: *Whoever amongst you sees an evil, then let him change it with his hand, if he is not able then with his tongue, and if he is not able then with his heart, and that is the weakest form of Imaan (faith).*” (Refer to Hukm ul-Intimaa Fee Masaa’il il-Khilaaf of Dr. Fadl Elaahi p.58).” End of quote from Shaikh Fawzee al-Atharee.

The lesson from the above, is that there is a difference between the matters of permissible ijtihaad and the matters of khilaaf in which there is clear opposition to the Book and the Sunnah, and they are not to be excused but refuted.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 28

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 40: Can you explain this term “The Vulture Culture” that is being propagated these days?

The term “Vulture Culture” has been coined by some of the biased partisans in order to discredit and belittle what has been revived of elements of the Sunnah which encourage caution and care with respect to taking knowledge and in the raising, making and praising of individuals. The term is now being propagated by certain elements in order to belittle and defame what the Salafis are upon of clarity in their deen and their aqeedah and their manhaj, especially in light of the recent tribulations of the Qutubiyyah, the activities of the sects of the Khawaarij, the Surooriyyah, and the Revolutionary Takfiris. The first time that the Salafis were accused of this “Vulture Culture” was when the Qutubiyyah (Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, Nasir al-Umar, Muhammad Sa’eed al-Qahtanee and others) began to accuse the likes of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee and the Madinan Scholars in general of this “Vulture Culture”. In reality, this was just an attempt to hide what was with them of their newly found Qutubi Manhaj, their loyalty for the Innovators and their raising and praising the groups of Innovation, loving and hating for their sake, and their political agendas. The famous incident of their distorting a certain statement of advice that came from Shaikh Ibn Baz and Shaikh Ibn Baz’s subsequent clarification of it, and his praise and defence of the Madinan Shaikhs and his labelling of those who distorted and misinterpreted it as “those who stir in the murky waters” and the “du’aat (callers) of falsehood” was a sufficient humiliation of them (refer to GRV070002 for full details)¹.

¹ Imaam Ibn Baaz said, “And our Brothers, the well known Scholars in Madeenah, **we do not have a doubt about them**. They are possessors of a sound aqeedah and they are from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah, such as Shaikh Muhammad Amaan bin Alee, Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, Shaikh Saalih bin Sa’d as-Suhaimee, Shaikh Faalih bin Naafi’, Shaikh Muhammad bin Haadee [al-Madkhalee] - **all of them are known to us to have Istiqaaamah, knowledge and sound aqeedah**. We ask increase in every good for them from Allaah and success in what pleases Him. **However the callers of falsehood (du’aat ul-baatil) and the people who hunt (others) in murky waters, they are the ones who cause confusion amongst the people and who**

However, this legacy of theirs of bringing down the Salafis and the Salafi Shaikhs by accusing them of the Vulture Culture in order to hide what is with themselves of deviation and heresy, continues today by other biased partisans.

In true reality, - if we were to acknowledge the concept behind this term that has been coined by the partisans - “the Vulture Culture”, then it is a term that depicts the mindset of the groups of innovation (Ahl ul-Bida’) and biased partisans (Hizbiyyoon) throughout the ages. By their nature, innovatory beliefs, practices and methodologies (manaahij) have no textual support or basis from the texts of the Book and the Sunnah. Hence, the innovation of a particular belief, practice or methodology is clothed with distortions of the Book and the Sunnah, in order to justify what has been innovated. Thereafter, loyalty and disownment is made based upon this innovation and anyone who does not agree to this innovation, is then targeted by “the Vulture Culture”. Being devoid of precedents from the Salaf for their innovations in belief, worship and methodologies (manaahij), participants of the Vulture Culture, then single out the notables from Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, Atharis, in order to hunt for their mistakes, and to ascribe impiety or ill-repute or innovation or harshness or other unbefitting terms to them. Often these accusations take the form of accusing Ahl us-Sunnah with the other extreme of the particular innovation at hand.

Question 41: Please give some examples of “the Vulture Culture” at work.

Abul-Fadl Abaas Ibn Mansoor as-Saksakee (683H), in his powerful Sunni, Salafi treatise said concerning Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah and the “Vultures” of the ages, “And every sect has called them with a name that is not in agreement with the true reality, out of envy of them and as a fabrication against them. And they ascribed to them (Ahl us-Sunnah) that which they did not hold as their doctrine. So the Qadariyyah labelled them “the Mujbirah”. The Murji’ah called them “the Shakkaakiyyah” (the doubters). The Raafidah called them “the Naasibah”. The Jahmiyyah called them “the Mushabbihah”. The Ash’ariyyah called them “the Mujassimah”. The Ghaaliyyah called them “the Hashawiyyah” (the worthless ones). The Baatiniyyah called them “the Muswaddah”. The Mansooriyyah (a sect of the Khawaarij), and they are the associates of Abdullaah Ibn Zaid, labelled them as Murji’ah due to their saying that the one who abandons the prayer, without rejecting its obligation, is a Muslim based upon the correct view in the madhhab. And they (the Mansooriyyah) say that this saying of their’s (i.e. that of Ahl us-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imaan is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them. Rather, they are the Firqat al-Haadiyyah al-Mahdiyyah (the Guiding and Guided Sect) and its creed is the

speak in these matters and they say: ‘The intent was this and that’, and this is not good. It is necessary to take the words in their best possible light. And the intent [behind the advice] was co-operation upon birr and taqwaa, and to purify the hearts and to warn against backbiting which causes rancour and enmity. We ask Allaah for guidance and success for all.” [The Tape: Explanation of Shaikh Bin Baaz of his Statement].

To use the language of the biased partisans themselves then we can say that in the words of Imaam Ibn Baaz is the clear indication that those who misinterpreted his statement of advice are actually the “Vultures” (remember, we did not coin this term, the partisans did, and hence we are using their terminology to illustrates the concepts they are trying to promote) who “hunt others in murky waters”.

correct creed and the clear and manifest Imaan (faith), that with which the Qur'aan was revealed and which has come in the Sunnah, and that which the Ulamaa of the Ummah from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah have agreed upon." Al-Burhaan Fee Ma'rifat Aqaa'idi Ahl il-Adyaan, (pp.65-66)

Thus, throughout the ages, Ahl us-Sunnah and its notables were singled out by the Vulture Culture, being called Mushabbihah (Anthropomorphist) by the Jahmiyyah and their offshoots (because they affirmed Allaah's attributes in manner that befits His Majesty, without asking how or likening them to the creation). The Ash'ariyyah called them "Mujassimah" for the same reason – the while the Ash'ariyyah rejected the narrations and resorted to their intellects in affirmation of attributes for Allaah, the Most High.

The Mu'tazilah, who revelled in their intellectual frivolity, and toying with the texts of the Book and the Sunnah, abused the Imaams of the Salaf with derogatory remarks such as their saying that the thought of ash-Shaafi'ee or Ibn Seereen or Hasan al-Basri does not extend beyond the torn cloths used by women for their menstruation cycles. This being an insult to them. The aim behind this slander was to raise the affair of the Mu'tazilah and to signify that they were the "Fuquhaa al-Waaqi'" (those who truly understand the affairs) .

They were also called Shakkaakiyyah (the Doubters) by the sects of the Murji'ah because Ahl us-Sunnah allowed making an exception in one's Imaan (i.e. to say "I am a believer if Allaah wills") – because of their belief that Imaan consists of parts, so it is belief, statement and action, and it is not merely one indivisible whole – as was believed by the Murji'ah. Hence, the Murji'ah, without being able to provide consistent and coherent proof from the Sunnah, had no resort but name-calling.

Ahl us-Sunnah were called "Mujbirah" by the Qadariyyah merely because they affirmed the Will (Iraadah, Mashee'ah) of Allaah over His servants, while also affirming that the servants have their own will, by which they choose to act. And similar insults have arisen from the Raafidah, Baatiniyyah, Khawaarij and others as has preceded.

In short, the Vulture Culture has been in full force ever since innovation and its rowdy hooligans first emerged following the demise of the Companions of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and has continued up until this day of ours and has permeated those who have made great and serious errors in the fields of calling to Allaah and rectifying the society and who are involved with activist and political methods.

Question 42: What are the manifestations of the Vulture Culture in the current times?

The Vulture Culture has seen increased activity in current times, due mainly to the proliferation of innovated methodologies in the twentieth century. These innovated methodologies allowed the existent sects and groups of innovation to further spread their teachings and orientations, leading to increased vulture-like activity against Ahl us-Sunnah. Generally speaking, Vulturism is maintained by the following:

- a) The Soofiyyah in general, which compromise the Jahmiyyah, Ash'ariyyah, Mutasawwifah and others – all of whom share varying degrees of Mysticism. They continue to call Ahl us-Sunnah “Mushabbihah”, “Mujassimah”, “Khawaarij” (because of their claim that Ahl us-Sunnah make takfir of common Muslims), and that they are “Wahhabis” and hate Allaah’s Messenger, and disrespect him and other such accusations
- b) The Muqallidah (blind-followers) who accuse Ahl us-Sunnah or rejecting the heritage of the four Imaams and rejecting their ijtihaads. This is because Ahl us-Sunnah do not allow the exclusive blind-following of any individual after the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and also hold that no one is infallible after the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). They state that a common person may ask anyone who is capable of giving a religious ruling rather than restricting himself to a single person only. Hence, the blind-followers who have closed the doors of ijtihaad and made the truth to be contained in only “one” of the four madhhabs see this as an affront to the four Imaams and what they left behind. This orientation comes mainly from the Sufis in general, Hanafis and Deobandis.
- c) The Modernists and Rationalists who accuse Ahl us-Sunnah as being backward, because they hold that the Book and the Sunnah were revealed for all times, ages and environments and that the Sunnah is eternally relevant. Figureheads of this group include Mohammad al-Ghazali, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, Jamal Badawi, Zaki Badawi (UK), Hasan Turabi (the zindeeq apostate) and many others. Often the rationalist and modernists are found amongst political activist groups and orientations.
- d) The Political Activists who accuse Ahl us-Sunnah of being in the dark ages, ignorant of the current affairs, with their heads buried in the sand like ostriches. They also accuse Ahl us-Sunnah of rejecting Jihaad, and of concepts of “collective work” within Islaam, and of being “stooges” and “pawns” and of supporting the “new world order”. All of this because Ahl us-Sunnah called for the return to the methodology of the Prophets in da’wah and rectification, away from the emotionalism, excitement, deceit and pretentiousness that often surrounds the “political activists”.

The above four orientations are the most clear ones and in which many individuals, groups and parties may fall, but they do represent a very broad classification. So for example, amongst the Ikhwaan you might find all four vulturite orientations, depending upon the individual you select. Certainly Ikhwaan fall into category d) and c). Likewise, the Tabligh fall into a) and b). Hizb ut-Tahrir, the Takfiris, the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah and others fall into d). The point being that if we transcend individuals and groups for the moment, we find that generally speaking there are four main spheres within which the Vulture Culture is to be found. The area of focus here however, is on orientation d), which relates to the dawah of Qutubiyyah, Bannaawiyyah and the inherent vulturism therein.

Question 43: It has been suggested that the Salafis are the “Vultures” and that they represent and signify the “Vulture Culture”.

This accusation has originated, been nurtured and propagated by diseased partisans who have their fair share of jahl (ignorance) of affairs of manhaj, and talbees (deception). The key proponents or propagators of this slander are the likes of Abu Aaliyah (UK) Abu Umar al-Jurjaani (a Takfiri-Jihadi who came to Yemen from Pakistan, while being poisoned with ideas of Takfir and Khurooj and who has yet to make open his repentance, after having been asked to repent by some scholars in Yemen for holding the view that the lands of the non-Muslims are dar ul-harb, and that stealing, taking slaves etc. is permissible – he has now return to the West, preaching to an audience that is largely unaware of his background). Many quotations have been sought out and spread by these individuals (from the likes of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, and contemporary scholars) which in reality serve to maintain the confusion that exists today between the truth and falsehood, and between the Salafi manhaj and the Bid'iyy Manaajih and to hide what is with these people of deviation.

The fitnah in recent times that has rocked Ahl us-Sunnah came from the direction of Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Suroor and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq. Collectively, these three individuals infused the thought of Hasan al-Banna and Sayyid Qutb into the Arabian peninsula. This led to the poisoning of certain individuals such as Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, Bin Ladin, Nasir al-'Umar and many others. This saw the emergence of many innovations and false concepts and ideas, such as the innovation of Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah, al-Muwaazanah, co-operating with the groups and sects of innovation and destruction, exaggeration in the affairs of “fiqh ul-waaqi”, reviving the way of the Khawaarij and performing takfir of the sinners, and open calls for revolution and rebellion against the authorities, and many other affairs. In reality, this saw the penetration of the Ikhwani da'wah within the heart of Ahl us-Sunnah and the revival of the concepts of Qutb and Banna.

This created a great deal of confusion amongst unsuspecting people who could not see what was going on around them. When Ahl us-Sunnah became aware of this great deviation and infiltration, they stood to purge these elements and their innovated ways and ideas. When the Salafi youth held onto the knowledge based positions of the Imaams of our times, like al-Albani, Ibn Baz, Ibn Uthaimeen, and others on these affairs, and began to propagate their verdicts and also began to take caution as to who they took their knowledge from and whom they befriended – following the great turmoil that had been created – they were slandered with the term “the Vulture Culture” – by a people who were grossly ignorant of the real state of affairs.

The true vultures are the likes of Sayyid Qutb who vultured on the flesh of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam) and that of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and that of Banu Umayyah and of some of the notable Companions. Or like Mohammad Qutb and Mohammad Suroor who mocked and reviled some of the notable Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah. Indeed, the books of the latter two are replete with vulture-like activity, preying on the flesh of the scholars – imputing the greatest of lies to them and belittling them with horrific insults. Or like Salman al-Awdah who called the major scholars as “scholars of women’s impurities” and

that they are “paid-workers”. Or like Safar al-Hawali who revived the age-old accusation of the Khaariji sect, the Mansooriyyah, that those who do not make takfir of the one who abandons the prayer out of laziness and neglect are Murji’ah. He is the one who vultured and binged on the flesh of Imaam al-Albani and Allaamah ash-Shanqeetee, let alone the vast majority of Ahl us-Sunnah. He is the one who vultured on the Permanent Committee by implying their senility and their inability to handle affairs – as was vultured by Salman al-Awdah who negated the existence of any body capable of issuing verdicts (Refer to GRV070004, Intermediate Qutubism). And then we have the Turaathi Vulture Culture of Hasan al-Banna II (Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq). His most famous vulturisms being his labelling the Permanent Committee “a group of blind men”, and also “a battalion of mummified bodies” and also “present in body, absent in mind” and also “the scholars of women’s menses” and many other slanders and insults.

And then there is that ingenious stratagem of Mohammad Qutb and his puppet (al-Hawali) of accusing the most notable of the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah, Imaam al-Albani of being upon Irjaa’, and for having parallels with the creed of Jahm Ibn Safwaan, and the great orgy of vulturism in this regard that they helped to spread over the globe, and by which they occupied the Ummah and its youth for a number of years.

Indeed the likes of these diseased partisans infused the youth with this destructive Vulture Culture that led to the shunning of the major scholars and the raising of the minors (asaaghir) who were but the siblings of the heads of innovation of our times (Hasan al-Banna, Aal Qutb, Suroor, Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq and others).

Despite all of this, the promoters of this “Vulture Culture” concept (the likes of Abu Aaliyah and al-Jurjaani and others) continue in their oblivion, and continue to assist the people of innovation and the confused partisans by hunting for the mistakes of the Salafis and vulturing over them, instead of assisting in repelling this fitnah that came from the direction of the Ikhwaan and their key figureheads to begin with.

At a time when Ahl us-Sunnah have been simultaneously assaulted by the Soofiyyah, the Muqallidah, the Rationalist school of thought, as well as the Political Activists in general (Ikhwaan, Hizb ut-Tahrir), the likes of these individuals come along and try to cover up the great new fraud that is neo-Qutubiyyah and neo-Bannaawiyyah, by their hidden attacks against the Salafis and using out of context quotations from our scholars in order to confuse the common-folk and to hide from the common-folk what has really happened to this noble da’wah in the last two decades and how the Ikhwaan have penetrated it, set up puppets inside of it, and created mass confusion within the pure da’wah of the Salafis.

So these accusations are lies and slanders and they arise, because due to the efforts of some of the notable scholars in purifying certain sciences related to this religion that had been corrupted by the Political Activists – the Salafi youth are now more cautious about who they take their knowledge from, and they implement the Sunnah by asking about individuals, their backgrounds, who they studied with, who they mix with and so on.

This was something unknown five, let alone ten years ago, when the neo-Qutubi-Bannawi onslaught was in full momentum. And this has caused a great and mighty disastrous blow to the politically orientated and activist methodologies whose success relies upon large numbers of generally ignorant people who are just filled with emotion and sentiment with little Sharee'ah knowledge.

Question 44: Can you give specific examples of the ways in which the Vulture Culture operates, or at least explain the tact?

Yes, firstly, the Vulture Culture attempts to “contain” and “compromise” the clarity that has been made concerning the sects of innovation and deviation in our times, such as the neo-Qutubiyah, the Khawaarij and the neo-Bannaawiyah and others. To this end certain ideas are promoted, which seek to create and nurture a common-platform or an apparent resemblance between the Salafi Manhaj and the Bannaawi-Qutubi-Khariji Manhaj – often by the promotion of certain statements of scholars which are either a) outdated or b) out of context or c) made at a time when full knowledge was not available (about an individual or a book or an event etc.) to that particular scholar on the subject at hand, or d) by the promotion of knowledge-based positions of certain scholars in a specific issue in order to justify the general manhaj-based orientation that is held by the deviants.

By compromising and containing this clarity, an implicit defence and protection is being made of the deviated methodologies.

Lets give an example that is known and clear walhamdulillaah. The “vultures” of the Qutubi-Bannaawi orientation promote the old and outdated verdicts of the Scholars concerning co-operating with the groups of innovation, such as Ikhwaan, Tabligh and Hizb ut-Tahrir – and in the process defend and hide what is with these groups of the Major Shirk, Kufr, Innovation and Zandaqah (heresy). Here, the groups of Innovation are being defended and promoted. At the same time, the Salafis are picked out and accused of being harsh and “judgemental” and so on about these groups, or perhaps individuals who are affiliated with these groups. If it is accepted – just for argument sake – that the Salafis are in error on this subject, then the nature and degree of their error – by way of argument - is rather insignificant to the nature and degree of the errors of the groups of Innovation that the biased partisans are promoting and defending and co-operating with, since the errors of these group are within the confines of Shirk and Kufr and major deviations in methodology. At the same time, no excuse, and no defence, and no protection and no praise do they make of what is with the Salafis of truth. And nor do they show sincerity of purpose in propagating the latest verdicts of the scholars, such as those of Imaam al-Albani on the Ikhwan and Tabligh, or Imaam Ibn Baz on Ikhwan and Tabligh and the Jihadi groups, or those of the other scholars.

In reality, the only reason for the defence of the groups of Innovation is so that the manhaj that the activists are upon – which is essentially political and excitatory – relies upon the masses in order for it to succeed. Hence, their great involvement with Shurocracy, parliamentary elections and other affairs – in which they require the assistance and co-operation of the groups of innovation and destruction. As for correcting and refuting these groups and what is with them of aspects of Major Shirk and aspects of Major Kufr

and great deviations, then they are not fundamentally concerned with this from at least a practical and action-based viewpoint. So this is Vulturism in operation here, or preying on the “mistakes” of the Salafis – if we accept for argument sake that in our example above, the Salafis are in error – while allowing the fat herd of Innovators and groups and sects of innovation to roam the fresh and fertile field of da’wah untouched and unscathed.

Another angle is that they use general, unqualified statements from some of the Scholars which they portray and interpret to mean that there is to be no rejection to be shown towards one who errs in manhaj. We will detail this in the next few questions, and illustrate how they twist and distort the sayings of the scholars, as well as selectively quote from them for the same objectives outlined above – to hide their own deviation and to find fault with the Salafis, i.e. to vulture over the Salafis, who are clear in their manhaj wal-hamdulillaah.

Another angle they use is to accuse Ahl us-Sunnah of hizbiyyah and that they use praiseworthy names in order to hide subtle hizbiyyah. This again is based upon their distortion of statements from the Scholars of Islaam, as we shall see in what is to proceed, inshaa’allaah. So they try to outline the so called hizbiyyah of the Salafis but they remain blind to the hizbiyyah that is characteristic of all the innovated methodologies that have plagued the da’wah in recent times – and refuse even to utter a word against it, or assist in repelling it – rather, often they try to defend it or even justify it!

Summarising, Vulturism, or call it the Vulture Culture is a key stratagem of Ahl ul-Bid’ah and those who are upon the deviated methodologies in the current times, yet they accuse Ahl us-Sunnah with it, in order to demonise them and to make the people flee from the clarity in the religion that is with Ahl us-Sunnah. As the poet said:

She accused me with her own iniquities, and then slowly slipped away



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 29

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 45: Some people use certain words of Imaam al-Albaani in order to defend those who err in Manhaj?

This is typical of the diseased partisans in that they try to defend and accommodate what has taken place in the current times of the great upheaval in the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah, the da'wah of the Salaf, due to the insurrections made into it by the likes of Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Suroor, Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq and others who have entered the concepts of Qutb and Banna into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah and made great deviations in the methodologies of the Sunnah and of the Salaf.

Imaam al-Albaani is the very same one who made tabdee' of the manhaj of those who erred and declared them "Khawaarij of the Era" and sought refuge from "the evil of what they are upon of ignorance, misguidance and scum" (as he said in "adh-Dhabb al-Ahmad..." p. 33). So this shows that either they do not understand Imaam al-Albaani's words, or they are using them deliberately in falsehood. As for the actual words they use, then it is worthy to comment upon them, in light of the principles that have been outlined in the previous questions and answers, since these words are against them, not for them. And these words of Imaam al-Albaani are in response to a question concerning those who from their ijtihaad set up Jam'iyyah's and set up bai'ahs for the ameer, and then hold certain views towards the groups and parties (i.e. accommodate them) and the rulers (i.e. revile them openly) and so on – and whether it can be said that they are not upon the manhaj of the Salaf in light of that.

So the Shaikh replied (to a question put to Shaikh al-Albani by Abul Hasan al-Misree, on the 10th of Rajab 1416H (12-21-1995) Taken from the Series: Silsilatul-Huda wan-Nur [847/9]):

“The reality - as we witness in this time - is that there is some going beyond bounds and some failing short of what is required, in answering the likes of this question. So it is fitting that each person be examined individually, and his words weighed and measured with the true balance.

Comment: Thus individuals are to be treated in their own right, with their sayings and actions evaluated according to the Manhaj of the Salaf, and with these words Shaikh al-Albaani has established the scales of judgement.

If we look at some of the Imaams of the Salafus-Saalih, and at some of their views and ijtihaads, then there is no doubt that we find some mistakes that they have made and which conflict with the authentic Sunnah. **However, as long as we have known from them that they cling to, the correct methodology - the Book, the Sunnah and what the Salafus-Saalih were upon** - despite differing in some aspects - for example: that if a Companion says a saying and no one contradicts him, then is such a saying a proof or not? So some of the Scholars say that it is not, whereas others say that it is. So the like of such difference does not necessarily take the one who disagrees, even if he is mistaken, out of being upon the methodology of the Salafus-Saalih.

Comment: The context has been set, and this is that the discussion is in reference to those who are upon the Manhaj of Salaf and cling to it – but then they differ in those issues of Ijtihaad in which there is no decisive judgement from the Book and the Sunnah or an Ijmaa’ from the Salaf. Errors in this regard do not expel someone from the Manhaj. Also, from the above it is clear that there are those types of differences which do not expel a person from the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih, and thus, there are those which actually do. And just look at the example that Shaikh al-Albaani has given!! The issue of whether the saying of a Companion that is not contradicted is proof or not. Do you think this is at the same level or even in the same category as making unrestricted takfir of the rulers? Or calling for unrestricted and unqualified rebellion? Or treating the lands of the non-Muslims as Dar ul-Harb and declaring stealing from them, killing them and taking women captive to be lawful (as was opined by the “Shahwaaniyyoon” (those who follow lusts), as Shaikh Muqbil called them)? Or defending the aggrandising the Innovators with the innovation of al-Muwaazanah (the use of which Imaam al-Albaani himself described as “the way of the Innovators” (refer to the articles on al-Muwaazanah MNJ120001, MNJ120002).

Now history repeats itself. So this individual who attributes himself to the Salafus-Saalih, then it will be said that he is with the Salafus-Saalih, or contrary to them, according to how close or distance he is to the reality of this connection to the Salafus-Saalih. Therefore, it is not correct to unrestrictedly remove any individual who openly declares, at least with his tongue - **and as long as he does not contradict by his actions that which he declares with his tongue** - then it is not correct to say that he is not a Salafee, **not as long as he calls to the way of the Salafus-Saalih**; and as long as he calls

the people to follow the Book and the Sunnah, and not to blindly and obstinately cling to a single Imaam, not to mention blindly and obstinately clinging to a Soofee order, not to mention blindly and obstinately clinging to a party.

Comment: So the condition is that a person be truthful in his ascription and if he claims to be following the Salaf, then in his words and actions he must be upon the way of the Salaf. And this expels many of the biased partisans those who claim that they are upon the Salafi Manhaj, but are in actual fact upon the aqeedah and manhaj of the Khawaarij, upon the manhaj of Hasan al-Bannaa, upon the the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and others – and all of that clearly apparent from their words and actions and the doctrines and principles they have invented. And it is also clearly apparent that they do NOT call to the way of the Salaf us-Saalih, rather they call to the way of Sayyid Qutb, or Hasan al-Bannaa, and they call to Hizbiyyah, and clinging to their own parties and groups, basing loyalty and disownment around their mentors and leaders like Sayyid Qutb and his modern-day followers. For all of these are actually in opposition to the Salafi Manhaj and call to this opposition (as Imaam al-Albaani himself stated, as we shall see later).

However, this individual has views which isolate him in some matters of ijtihaad¹, and this is bound to occur, since even the Imaams of the Salaf differed with regard to some matters. However, what matters to us is the principle - does he believe in it? Does he call to it?

Comment: And there is a great difference in being isolated in some matters of permitted Ijtihaad (i.e. affairs in which there is no clear ruling from the Book and the Sunnah) and between being isolated by a well-defined, overall manhaj, that is clearly in opposition to the way of the Salaf, from a variety of different angles. And further, what did the Imaams of the Salaf differ in amongst themselves. All of them, were upon the aqeedah and manhaj of the Salaf, clinging to that and adhering to it in principle, internally and externally – and they were not affected, fundamentally by the calls of the groups of innovation – in the generality of their affairs – even if some of them made mistakes in certain specific issues.

So we know, as we have more than once said, that you do not find upon the face of the earth a group - at least from those who say that they are from Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah - who says that the way of the Pious Predecessors is error. Even if they do not follow this way in reality, yet still they are not able to say that it is error. So this individual who calls to the following of the Pious Predecessors - **both in reality and in da'w'ah** who may disagree in some details, then we are not able to remove him from his attribution, which he publicises openly that he follows, due to some violations. However, these violations may be matters of an individual nature - such that only affect him

¹ Shaikh Fawzee al-Atharee, a student of Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen explains, “The issues of ijtihaad are those in which there is no text from the Book or the Sunnah or from Ijmaa’, or those in which there is a text but it is not free of what may oppose it and which has a similar strength to it in terms of being established (i.e. in terms of authenticity) or in its proof of indication.” (Paper on the Issues of Khilaaf and Ijtihaad)

personally, or affecting those who are close to him - or they be things which may greatly affect the society also.

Thus, this affect will either be far or close to the methodology of the Salafus-Saalih. But as for our describing those individuals who call to following the Book and the Sunnah; **but not just this alone, but upon the methodology of the Salafus-Saalih** - but they may differ in some matters - then it is not fitting that we accuse them of being upon something other than the way, unless they proclaim this openly.

Comment: Once again Shaikh al-Albaani mentions the condition clearly once more, which is that it is not sufficient that one merely claim adherence to the Book and the Sunnah, and even to the Salaf, but that one must be upon their actual manhaj, in reality and in one's method of da'wah.

So, for example, it has reached us from some of them that they said: **We follow the Salaf in their 'aqeedah and in their knowledge, but not in their means! So this is a fundamental contradiction to the methodology of the Salafus Saalih, indeed it is contrary to the dawah of the Messenger sallallahu alayhi wa sallam, who gave full importance to Tawheed in the Makkan period, as is known.**

Comment: Allaahu Akbar! And is this but the very way of the neo-Qutubiyyah and neo-Bannaawiyyah?! Those who say the books of the Salaf are “dry” and “irrelevant to our times” and who have invented a whole new manhaj around Sayyid Qutb's Haakimiyyah, and who have many innovated ways and means in their da'wah (many of which Imaam al-Albaani himself refuted) – and who have at the same time labelled the Salafis as “Qadariyyah” and “Jabariyyah” merely because they adhered to the way of the Salaf in calling to the overall comprehensive Tawheed and refuting its opposers from the Mushriks and Innovators? Indeed, this is the same group that Imaam al-Albaani himself described as “Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah”.

The other jamaa'ahs who say that they are upon the Book and the Sunnah who do not give importance to the call to Tawheed. Indeed you may find amongst them those who say that this most important da'wah splits the people and does not gather them, so we must distance it from the da'wah. So these people, for certain, are not Salafees. **So if some people reach the likes of this level in distancing themselves from the Pious Predecessors - even if he attributes himself in his words and in his da'wah to being upon the methodology of the Salafus-Saalih - then this is merely a word which he says.”**

Comment: Allaahu Akbar! Where did the term “neo-Salafis” and “Salafiyyah Jadeedah” come from? And who accused the Salafis (and chief amongst them Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee) of splitting and dividing the Ummah? And who accused them of making takfir of the groups and parties? And who accused them of being Khawaarij with the Callers? And

who accused them of being Murji'ah with the Rulers? And all of this when Ahl us-Sunnah correctly expounded "The Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah, the way of Intellect and Wisdom". So when Shaikh Rabee' wrote this book, by Allaah it became a thorn in the throats of every drowning Hizbee, who was upon the Qutubi manhaj of Aal Qutb and who was upon the Bannaawi Novelty of Aal Bannaa. Speak a truthful word to yourself O Sunni, and let yourself answer, what was the response of the Biased Partisans, when Ahl us-Sunnah called for a correction of the da'wah and its ways and means?! Likewise when Shaikh Rabee' destroyed al-Muwaazanah, and was aided and supported in that by all the Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah, then who are the ones who opposed him and refuted him? It was the biased partisans who did not wish to unite and split the people based upon Tawheed and the Sunnah and Manhaj of the Salaf, but only wished to gather everybody under one umbrella in the name of collective work (i.e. Shurocracy) and the maslahah (benefit) of the da'wah – such as the likes of Salman al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq. Indeed, the claim of adhering to the manhaj of the Salaf which occurs from many of the groups of Hizbiyyah and organisations of Partisanship are **"merely words"** that they utter.

Shaikh al-Albani was asked concerning the book, "Dhaahiratul-Irjaa' fil-Fikr al-Islaami" of Safar al-Hawali, and in this book takfir is performed on account of certain sins! He replied: "I gave my viewpoint on a matter about thirty or so years ago when I used to be in the [Islamic] University (of Madinah) and I was asked in a gathering about my opinion on Jamaa'at ut-Tabligh. So I said on that day, 'They are the Sufis of this era'. **And now it is clear to me that I should say about this Jamaa'ah who have emerged in the present times and who have opposed the Salaf**, I say here, in accordance with the statement of al-Hafidh adh-Dhahabi: **They have opposed the Salaf in much of the issues of manhaj**, and it is befitting that I label them **"the Khawarij of the Era"**. And this resembles their emergence at the current time – in which we read their statements – because they, in reality, their words take the direction and objective of that of the Khawarij in performing takfir of the one who commits major sins. And perhaps I should say, this is either due to ignorance on their behalf or due to devised plot!!..." (Cassette: The Khawarij of the Era).

And indeed, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen actually declares their opposition to be an opposition in aqeedah. Refer to GRV070021 for the following discussion:

"Questioner: O Shaikh! Even if in this matter - for example - their is difference (khilaaf), so they make takfir of the Rulers and they say that this is Jihaad - for example - in Algeria, and they listen to the cassettes of Salmaan and Safar al-Hawaali. So is this khilaaf (difference) one that is far'ee (i.e. subsidiary, as opposed to fundamental)?! Or is it a difference in the Usool (fundamentals) O Shaikh?!!

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen: **No! This is a difference in aqeedah (khilaaf aqdiyy)**, because it is from the Usool of Ahl us-Sunnah that we do not make takfir of anyone on account of a sin!"

Questioner: They, O Shaikh, do not make takfir of one who commits major sin, except the Rulers, they come with the verse, "Whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Disbelievers", and they make takfir of the Rulers only?!!

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen: **"There is an athar (narration) from Ibn Abbaas concerning this verse, which explains that the intent is the kufr which does not expel from the religion,** as occurs in the saying of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), "Reviling Muslim is sin (fusooq) and fighting him is kufr (disbelief). And in the view of the some of Mufasssiroon, it was actually revealed for the People of the Book, this is because the actual context of the passage is what occurs before, "Verily, We did send down the Taurât (Torah) [to Mûsa (Moses)], therein was guidance and light, by which the Prophets, who submitted themselves to Allâh's Will, judged the Jews. And the rabbis and the priests [too judged the Jews by the Taurât (Torah) after those Prophets] for to them was entrusted the protection of Allâh's Book, and they were witnesses thereto. Therefore fear not men but fear Me (O Jews) and sell not My Verses for a miserable price. And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the Kâfirûn (i.e. disbelievers - of a lesser degree as they do not act on Allâh's Laws)." (5:44)".

And it is known that the methodology of these people is centred around Sayyid Qutb's extremist ideology of takfir and revolution.

Imaam al-Albaani also said about this firqah, "And Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has explained the perspective from which faith, Imaan, consists of actions, and that it increases and decreases - [his discussion] needing no further elaboration - in his book 'al-Imaan'. So the one who requires more detail can refer back to it. **I say: This is what I used to write for more than twenty years, affirming the madhhab of the Salaf and the aqidah of Ahl us-Sunnah - and all praise is due to Allaah - in the issues pertaining to Imaan, and then there come - in the present times - reckless ignoramuses, who are but young newcomers accusing us of Irjaa!! To Allaah is the complaint of the evil that they are upon, of ignorance, misguidance and scum...**". (Adh-Dhabb al-Ahmad an Musnad al-Imaam Ahmad, p.33, 1999, 1420H).

So whoever used the words of Imaam al-Albaani (that occur previously) in order to defend the deviations of the neo-Qutubiyyah, then either he is Jaahil of the true realities, or he is a concealed Hizbi, wishing to defend the baatil, in the name of haqq.

Rather, the context of Imaam al-Albaani's words are clear in that any person who is **manifestly upon the manhaj of the Salaf in his da'wah** and then errs in matters of permissible ijtihaad or makes genuine errors (which are known as such by the fact that when he is corrected, he returns and accepts the truth) then he is not to be expelled from being upon the way of the Salaf in Manhaj. Indeed the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam quoted earlier are appropriate here from one perspective:

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "Their saying 'there is no rejection to be shown for the issues of khilaaf' is not correct. For rejection is to be shown either to the ruling (made)

or to the action. As for the first, if it is a saying that opposes the Sunnah or past Ijmaa' it is obligatory to reject it by unanimous agreement. And if it is not the case (that it opposes any of that) then it is rejected in the sense of explaining its weakness, and this is in the view of those who say that "the truth is only one", and this is the generality of the Salaf and the Fuqahaa (Jurists).

As for an action, then if it is in opposition to the Sunnah or an Ijmaa' then it is obligatory to reject it according to the various degrees of showing rejection, as we have illustrated from the hadeeth related to the one who drinks nabeedh² about which there is difference of opinion. Just as the ruling of a judge is invalidated when he opposes a Sunnah, even if he had followed one some of the Ulamaa' in that. As for when there does not exist anything in the Sunnah or from Ijmaa' on this issue then performance of Ijtihaad in this issue is permissible and rejection is not to be shown against one who acted upon this based upon ijtihaad or taqleed.

Certainly, this confusion has arisen from the perspective that a person believes that the issues of khilaaf are actually the issues of ijtihaad, as has been held by numerous factions of people who do not have any ability or firm grounding in knowledge..." (Refer to Aadaab ush-Sharee'ah 1/169).

This is from one angle, namely that a person who falls into that which is clear opposition to the Book and the Sunnah, even by way of Ijtihaad, then his error is to be shown rejection and refuted. However, in all of this, there is a difference between those who fall into this while manifestly upon the manhaj of the Salaf, calling to it and adhering to it (in which case they remain upon this manhaj, despite their error, and despite their being corrected and refuted, but they are not expelled from it), and between the blameworthy partisans, who are upon other than the manhaj of the Salaf, calling to other than it, and then falling into blameworthy khilaaf (opposition). And the People of Baatil have attempted to apply the above words of Imaam al-Albaani, to defend the Lords of Adulterated Methodologies, who have arisen in the current times and opposed many of the issues of manhaj of the Salaf – and in Allaah is the refuge.

And this is not strange behaviour from them, rather it is something that is expected since, they have in the past used some very old and abrogated words of Imaam al-Albaani in their attempted defence of the likes of Sayyid Qutb, and his modern-day disciples, such as Safar and Salmaan. To this day, the biased partisans continue in their deceit by presenting some very old statements of Shaikh al-Albaani, while feigning ignorance of what we have quoted above.

And it is so strange and amazing that the likes of these partisans have arisen now and are using the words of Imaam al-Albaani to attack the Salafis, because as they claim that they make tabdee' upon the people and slander them, when the very ones that the Salafis are refuting and exposing (i.e. the Qutbiyyah, the Hizbiyyoon and their loyalists amongst those who praise and aggrandise the Innovators) made tabdee' of Imaam al-Albaani(!!!)

² A form of khamr.

and declared him to be worse in his Irjaa' than Jahm Ibn Safwaan(!!!) and declared the Saudi Shaikhs such as Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen, Shaikh Fawzaan, Shaikh Rabee' and others as "the scholars of women's menses and impurities" and "a battalion of mummified bodies"(!!!) and al-Albaani, Ibn Baaz and Ibn Uthaimeen collectively as "ath-Thaalooh" (i.e. rhyming with at-Taaghoot, because they never spoke openly against the Rulers and did not revile them upon the pulpits). Allaahu Akbar!! How the scales of justice are overturned for the Salafis at every opportunity.

More Clarity from Imaam al-Albaani

Indeed, what strengthens our analysis above are many other statements of Imaam al-Albaani which can be found in many of his writings and his cassettes, all of which speak of the necessity of adhering to the Salafi Manhaj in order to remain within it. And we will illustrate here with a notable example:

Imaam al-Albaani was asked a number of questions concerning the situation in Algeria and the topics of takfir and khurooj, and these appeared in the newspaper "al-Khabar al-Usboo'ee, 29th June 1999). Amongst his answers is the following:

"...and for this reason we support everyone who calls for the refutation of those who rebel against the Rulers, and who encourage the Muslims to rebel against the Rulers, since this rebellion is itself exiting from Islaam³. Whoever claimed Salafiyyah (i.e. to be upon the Salafi way), which is but the Book and the Sunnah, then he must traverse the actual path of the Salaf, otherwise the name itself (Salafiyyah) does not hide the reality of what is beneath it.

And I have just mentioned that it is from the call of the Scholars without exception that it is not permissible to make khurooj and nor takfir (unrestrictedly), and hence whoever did not respond to the call of those Scholars, then we do not call him "a Salafi"!... The Salafi da'wah fights against hizbiyyah (partisanship) in all of its forms and types, and the reason is very clear indeed. The Salafi da'wah ascribes itself to an infallible individual that is the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). As for the various other factions, then they ascribe themselves to individuals who are not infallible. Sometimes they themselves could be righteous people, and sometimes there could be amongst them scholars who act, but they themselves are not like that.

Finally, and in closing, so and so may be "Salafi" or so and so may be a "Salafi Jamaa'ah" but they do not act upon the Salafi da'wah which is the Book and the Sunnah and adhering to what the Salaf were upon. And if they do not (act upon this) then they are actually leaving, exiting the Salafi da'wah, and the evidence that I finish with is the saying of Allaah the Blessed and Almighty, **"And whoever contends with the Messenger after the guidance has been clearly shown to him and chooses a way other than that of the Believers, then We shall leave him in the path he has chosen and burn him in Hell, what an evil refuge."** (Nisaa 4:115).

³ Meaning, that this particular action, in this particular way (i.e. unrestrictedly, without conditions and guidelines) is outside of the way of Islaam, meaning it does not belong to it.

For this reason, every Jamaa'ah that claims ascription to the Salaf, if they do not act upon what the Salaf were upon, and amongst these affairs are what we are talking about, which is that it is not permissible to make unrestricted takfir of the Rulers and nor to make unrestricted rebellion against them, then it is merely a claim that they make (and nothing else). And the falsehood in this matter (of theirs) is very clear.” End of the quote. (Refer to Fataawaa Ulamaa il-Ummah Feemaa Uhdira min Dimaa'in Fil-Jazaa'ir pp.96-98).

And Imaam al-Albaani said, “For this reason, we firmly and resolutely believe that every Jamaa'ah whose foundation is not built upon the Book and the Sunnah and the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih with a complete and comprehensive study (of that manhaj) which encompasses all the rulings pertaining to Islaam, the large and the small, the foundations and the subsidiary issues, **then this Jamaa'ah is not from the Firqah Naajiyah that traverses upon the Straight Path which the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) alluded to in the authentic hadeeth.** And when he have also made binding that there are (certainly) many Jamaa'aat (groups) spread throughout the Islamic lands who are upon this particular manhaj, then these groups are not sects (ahzaab), rather they all constitute a single Jamaa'ah whose manhaj is one and whose path is one.⁴ And their being separated in the land is not a separation based upon ideology, creed or manhaj but one that is based upon their being in different lands, in opposition to the Jamaa'aat and Ahzaab (sects) who are all in a single land, yet despite that, every sect rejoices with that which is with it (of ideas and methodologies)...” (In Fataawaa Shaikh al-Albaani' p.106-114 compiled by Ukkaashah Abdul-Mannan at-Tiyyi)

In summary, Imaam al-Albani distinguishes between those who hold onto the Salafi manhaj in knowledge and action and call to it openly, inwardly and outwardly, and yet make mistakes in certain areas and between those who call themselves Salafis and label their Jamaa'ah with “Salafi” yet do not traverse the path of the Salaf in their actions. And this is in fact very clear from the very first quotation above, that the biased partisans used in order to belittle deviations and errors in manhaj. So all of this wal-hamdulillaah is very clear indeed. And as Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen said in his advice on July 28th 2001 via Telelink to the UK, “I do not say: be united upon a single view, because this is not possible. There will certainly be differences in views. **But be together upon a single manhaj (way and methodology).** None should separate and be aloof from the others; even if you differ in view. So see that the companions – radiyallaahu ‘anhum – would have different opinions, **but their manhaj (methodology and way) was one, and the Ummah was one.**” And these words are actually approximate in meaning to those of Imaam al-Albaani.

Further, the case of specific individuals is actually looked at in light of these same principles, as has preceded from the words of Imaam al-Albaani himself- and the mere act of calling oneself Salafi and calling one's way and da'wah to be Salafi is useless unless it is

⁴ And they are those who adhered to the Salafi Mashaayikh and their Imaams in the issues of methodology that the ‘Khawaarij of the Era’ opposed and adulterated, from amongst the issues of Tawheed, advising and correcting the Rulers, takfir and khurooj, al-Muwaazanah, methodology of giving da'wah and others that we have detailed elsewhere in this treatise.

corroborated by action that conforms to the Salafi way. Additionally, Shaikh al-Albaani himself noted that there is not a single group or person who does not claim to be following the way of the Salaf. In other words, no one says we are not upon the way of the Salaf and we do not follow them and that we are not “Salafi” so to speak (from the point of view of its meaning). Rather, everyone claims that. But, the claim is useless and empty, unless the actions prove it.

Then, what exactly is the manhaj of the Qutubiyyah and the neo-Bannaawiyyah and the generality of the Political Activists and the Khaarijites of today? Are they upon the manhaj of the Salaf in their da’wah to Allaah? Why then did they scorn and ridicule the book of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, “The Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah”, and why did they innovate Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah and innovate their call and activism around it, while the most senior and major scholars refuted it? Are they upon the manhaj of the Salaf in dealing with the Innovators? Why then did they raise, praise and aggrandise the Innovators and declare them Shaheeds and Imaams of Guidance? Are they upon the methodology of the Salaf in Jarh wat-Ta’deel? Why then did they innovate al-Muwaazanah – their Trojan Horse, used to defend and enter the Innovators into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah? Are they upon the manhaj of the Salaf in the affairs of Takfir and Khurooj? Why then did they call our Imaams (Albani, Ibn Baz, Ibn Uthaimeen) as stooges and pawns and why did they call them Murji’ah, upon the Irjaa of Jahm Ibn Safwaan, and why did they reject the advice of these three Imaams concerning the Algerian revolution and to the Algerian factions? Indeed, there is so much more, but by Allaah where is the manhaj of the Salaf and where is the manhaj that the diseased partisans are attempting to defend and accommodate?

Indeed, the “Shahwaaniyyoon” who use the above words of Imaam al-Albaani (even though they are against them, not for them) in order to defend their own baatil and what they are upon of deviated methodologies and corrupted ways that are alien to the Sunnah can hardly argue that their positions (related to takfir, khurooj, dar ul-harb and others) can be justified by legal and lawful ijtihaads! They are nothing but the way of the Innovators, and the sects and groups of innovation, as anyone with a share of knowledge knows.



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 30

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 46: There are some people who claim to be upon the Salafi manhaj but identify themselves with “as-Sahwah” (the Revival, or Awakening). What are they actually upon and what are they calling to?

They are the Harakiyyoon (Activists) and they are upon the manhaj of Hasan al-Bannaa and Sayyid Qutb, even if they call themselves Salafis, and claim adherence to the Sunnah, and write and publish in the name of Salafiyyah! Rather, they are Bannaawiyyoon and Qutubiyyoon, their true guides and leaders being Bannaa and Qutb, and whoever has adopted the ways of these Innovators.

Jamaal bin Fareehaan al-Haarithees writes in his notes to Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan’s fatwa concerning the “Shabaab of the Sahwah” (i.e. the Youth of the Awakening):

“The word Sahwah’ or Shabaab us-Sahwah’ or ‘as-Sahwat al-Islaamiyyah’ is repeated often between some of the callers and some of the youth. And it is from the point of view that the Islamic Ummah has actually been asleep or actually absent, and that there was no da’wah in its midst. And all of this is incorrect, for the Muslims, and especially in this land - there has never ceased to be good found within them, and all praise is due to Allaah, due to the saying of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), “There will never cease to be a group from my Ummah upon the truth, uppermost”, and also his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam’s) saying, “My Ummah shall never unite upon misguidance”.

And the Ummah of Muhammad has never ceased to be alert, ready, and the rabbaaniyyoon scholars are present in every age and era, generation after generation. In no time, during any of the times (of Islamic history) has there been the absence of a scholar – rather scholars. And if we had said anything other than this, then we would have lied upon al-Mustafaa (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and we seek refuge from that, the one who said in the hadeeth saheeh, “There will never cease to be a group from my Ummah,

fulfilling the command of Allaah, those who oppose them or abandon them will never harm them, (and they will remain like this) until the command of Allaah arrives, and they will be uppermost amongst the people”, reported by Muslim (no. 1037).

Verily, those who speak about ‘the Sahwah’ and who write its history, then they only write about it from the perspective of the history of the emergence and spreading of the Ikhwaan ul-Muslimeen in Egypt, at the hand of its founder and guide, Hasan al-Banna. And what gives evidence to this is what has been said by Mohammad Qutb, “Verily, we study this emergence, the emergence of the Islamic awakening, which had actually began in the heart of one man – meaning al-Hasan al-Bannaa – Allaah had opened this affair through him and granted him the illumination of the spirit and the purity of the connection with Allaah...” (Waaqi’unaa al-Mu’aasar p.401).

I say: This is actually a Soofee phrase and understanding – and all praise is due to Allaah that he did not say, “...who acquired knowledge from the well-known and famous Mashaayikh amongst the people of Knowledge...”, such that the people should say that he is “a scholar”.

The intelligent people do not trust except the scholars, and as for the common rabble amongst them, then they trust every so and so. Mohammad Qutb also says, (p. 403), “This illumination in the heart (of Hassan al-Banna) and in his soul was a divine opening... and this at the same time was a true and correct response to the various events that have taken place for over a century in the Islamic world in general and in Egypt specifically...”

What is understood from these words is that the da’wah of the Ikhwaan was set up in response to events and actions!¹

And Mohammad Qutb has also written a book called “as-Sahwah al-Islaamiyyah” and the publisher of the book noted in the introduction, “the Islamic Awakening – whose light has filled the Islamic world - has represented the greatest event in the second-half of the twentieth century”.

And Mohammad Qutb says in the book itself (p.75), “The Islamic Awakening came at its promised and destined time with Allaah, even though it may have taken people by surprise, here and there”. I say: There is no doubt that everything is by the decree of Allaah, however there is no goodness in this stumbling, straying Sahwah (Awakening).

He also says (p.63), “And then there came the movement of the Imaam, the Shaheed², while the Ummah was in this state of heedlessness, except whomever Allaah showered

¹ Meaning that their da’wah was not built upon the Qur’aan and the Sunnah and the call to Tawheed and the Sunnah, and purification of the religion and nurturing the people upon what the Salaf were upon, but it was in response to events. And this is the same with the da’wah of all of the Innovators, in that their da’wah and understanding of the Book and the Sunnah is made to fit around the specific events or occurrences that give rise to them and no the other way around. [Translator]

² And this is from repugnant Irjaa, and is the actual basis of Irjaa (i.e. the abandonment of Istithnaa!). Abdur-Rahman bin Mahdi – may Allah have mercy upon him – said, “The basis of

with His mercy.” And he also said (p.96), under the heading, “The methodology of the movement”, “The various groups active today differ... concerning the methodology that is obligatory to follow... for the movement used to traverse upon the methodology that the Imaam and Shaheed had laid down and had built his Jamaa’ah upon its foundations. And there had not been in his time, any other Jamaa’ah in the arena (of da’wah work) except for that Jamaa’ah”.

I say: So where was the Da’wah Salafiyyah which was long established in this land – and in others and which was at its peak and strength at that time – and to this day – and all of the Muslims have never ceased to see its blessed fruits – without any harms unlike the various other calls (da’wahs) – up until this day. The saying of the poet applies to these type of people:

*The truth is like the sun, and the eyes are the onlookers
However, it is actually hidden from those who are blind*

And Bakr Abu Zaid said in his book, “Mu’jam al-Manaahi al-Lafdhiyyah” (p.209), concerning the phrase, “as-Sahwah al-Islaamiyyah”, “This description has not had any judgement passed over it by Allaah, since it is a new term and we do not know of it ever having been used upon the tongues of any of the Salaf. Its usage only came about in the openings of the 15th century after hijrah, after the Disbelievers, such as the Christians returned to the Church, and then it slowly found its way to the Muslims. Hence, it is not permissible for the Muslims to take on the “foreign clothing” from them in the affairs of the religion, and nor the creation of slogans that Allaah and His Messenger have not granted permission for, since the Islamic terms are restricted to a text: Islaam, Imaan, Ihsaan, Taqwaa, and then the one who ascribes to them, Muslim, Mu’min, Muhsin, Taqiy. So I wish I only knew what exactly is this ascription to this innovated ‘as-Sahwah al-Islaamiyyah’, crying out loud or what??” End of quote from Jamaal bin Fareehaan al-Haarithe (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah, pp.85-87).

And Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan upon hearing this word “Shabaab us-Sahwah” in the text of the questioner, responded, “I am cautious about the use of this word, as-Sahwah al-Islaamiyyah - yet it has been spread in the newspapers on more than one occasion - due to what it contains of the rejection (juhood) of the efforts and striving of the Righteous Scholars of all times, and a rejection of those who remain and are yet to come from this Ummah, and which the earth will never be devoid of until the Hour is established.” (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah, p.87).

After all of that O Salafi, Athari, you will come to realise that the vast majority of Harakiyyoon, amongst the Qutubiyyah, Turaathiyyah, Bannaawiyyah, and their splinter groups – then know that all of them came from the darkness and whisperings of the soul of one or two men, and they are Qutb and Bannaa and of the Prophetic Da’wah and of the Salafi manhaj they are free and innocent as is the milk from the blood and dung.

Irjaa’ is Istithnaa, to not except oneself (or others from having perfect Imaan or from being guaranteed Paradise etc.)” [Translator]

And as for the doctrinal originators of the “Sahwah” of the last century, then they are Mawdudi, Bannaa and Qutb. The first of whom made Islaam to be but revolution, and the call of the Prophets to be but coups and topplings and overthrows. Then there came al-Bannaa whose concern was with the overall Imaamah, and then Qutb followed them, perfecting and completing the affair with his doctrines of “Jaahiliyyah”, “al-Uzlah”, takfir and khurooj, and assassinations and destroying the infrastructures of societies. And this is the actual Sahwah that Mohammad Qutb entered into Ahl us-Sunnah, may Allaah cause it to die, a hasty and quick death for the benefit of Islaam and the Muslims.

And there is no doubt that the origin of the destruction and poisoning of many of the so called “callers” – and their introduction to the Heretical Innovators - came from the direction of Mohammad Qutb, as we have outlined earlier in this series – all of whom rejected the existence of the Scholars – the Taa’ifat ul-Mansoorah, the Firqat un-Naajiyah, who are present – by the praise of Allaah – in every age and era – and they are the As.haabul-Hadeeth, the people of the narrations, the rabbaaniyyoon scholars, who are upon the Salafi manhaj, uppermost, aided and protected by Allaah. Rather, they [the Harakiyyoon] reviled them and mocked them and abused them – and then toyed with their new found novelties.

Therefore, we remind all of those who ascribe themselves to the Harakiyyoon, the Bannaawiiyyoon, the Qutubiyyoon, (such as the likes of Safar and Salman, and Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq and ash-Shu’aybee and al-Qahtaanee and others) you and your activities are but the products of the whisperings in the souls of men, who were Innovators, Strayers, Wanderers! Then another matter: Know O Sunni, Salafi, Athari, that this so called “Sahwah” is all geared and aimed at one thing and it is but the collective arena of Politics, Rule and Haakimiyyah – and it is for this reason, that all of these groups are from the generality of the Khawaarij, whose end result will be the sword – and refuge is from Allaah.

Abu Qilaabah said, **“Never does a man introduce and innovation except that he makes lawful the use of the sword.”** (Al-I’tisam 1/113 and ad-Daarimee 1/58 no.99). And he also said (as narrated through Ayub as-Sakhtiyaanee), **“...And certainly their saying differs but they have united upon the sword, and I do not consider their destination to be but the Fire.”** (Ad-Daarimee (1/58 no. 100). Ayub as-Sakhtiyaanee would call of the People of Innovation, “Khawarij” and would say, **“Verily, the Khawaarij differ in their names, but are agreed upon the use of the sword.”** (Al-I’tisaam 1/113).

Additionally, all of these movements are in opposition to and have deviated from the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and have become sects and parties, each of them rejoicing with that which is with them of innovated awakenings and sentimental arousings – all of which come and go, weaken and strengthen – not in accordance with the Book and the Sunnah, but in accordance with events and occurrences. So they are driven by occurrences and events in their da’wah and are not driven by the Book and the Sunnah fundamentally in their da’wah and in their manhaj.

And it is for this reason that you see most of these groupings and collections of individuals, when the calamities and afflictions befall the Muslims – one by one -, they are the ones who are greatly shaken, and tossed and turned, with the least resolve and with very little patience – and they are driven by emotions and sentiments and hawaa in the likes of these times – all but sacrificing the way of the Sunnah and the Prophetic methodology of reform and rectification, belittling it, mocking it, degrading, and calling it from the ways of the Murji'ah and Qadariyyah – for the sake of the slogans of the lowly ignorant ones who only come and speak out in the times of the crises and fitan – the Ruwaibidah – and whose true loyalty lies with the Heretical Innovators, the Mockers of the Prophets, and the Mukaffiroon of the Sahaabah. For the most part, they cannot show patience, and they cannot show resolve and they cannot understand where these calamities came from, and nor why they are taking place, and nor how to repel them, and they, like the hasty youths at the time of al-Hasan al-Basri, rush to their sentiments, and to their Qutubism, and to their 'fiqh ul-waaqi' and to their empty slogans of Jihaad (not even knowing or understanding what it actually is and what it is for and what is its base and foundation and what is its types and levels and priorities and what is its peak, and how it is arrived at, and how it is guaranteed success, and so on) – devoid of any tasfiyah (since refuting the Innovators is not from their ways, and is but harshness, and splitting the ranks) or tarbiyah (nurturing the Ummah upon correct, righteous actions, upon Ikhlâas and Tawhîd is but defeatism and leniency) or firm grounding in either knowledge or action. And this is the unfortunate state and condition that has been brought upon a fair portion of the Ummah by the so-called “as-Sahwah al-Islamiyyah” over the decades- a fruitless barren one – and in Allaah is the refuge – and may He cause it to die and give ascendancy to the true call of the Prophets, in which true rectification, success and victory lies!

“Thus it is necessary for these groups to correct their concepts and understanding, by referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to know the methodology of the Messengers in calling to Allaah. For indeed Allaah - the One free from all imperfections - informed that correct rule and sovereignty, which is the central part of the call of the former jamaa 'ah whom we mentioned, cannot be achieved except after correcting aqeedah, such that all worship is for Allaah alone and worship of everything else is abandoned. Allaah - the Most High - says:

Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan³ (true faith and belief) and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those before them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their

³ And this is the Imaan of the Salaf, the sound and pure Imaan – not what the Biased Partisans have chosen to remain silent about from the books of the Heretical Innovators such as Qutb and Bannaa, all of which contain the madhhab of Jahm Ibn Safwaan, that of the Mu'tazilah, the Mufawwidah, the Soofiyyah, the Mutasawwifah, the Ash'ariyyah and other than them. And this is the end result of the people of as-Sahwah – Irjaa towards the Innovators and belittlement of the sound and pure aqeedah.

fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors. Soorah an-Noor 24:55

So these people wish to establish the Islaamic State before purifying the lands of idolatrous beliefs which take the form of worship of the dead, and devotion to the tombs - such as is no different to the worship of al-Laat, al-Uzzaa and the third of them Manaata, rather it is worse. So they are attempting that which is impossible...” (Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan in his introduction to ‘Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa’ of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee).